



DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

1/5



CLOSED  
STACKS

SAN FRANCISCO  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

REFERENCE  
BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library  
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER  
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEC 1 2 1995

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 03476 7328



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2012 with funding from  
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

<http://archive.org/details/18minutesofsanfran1971sa>

DIRECTOR'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 1, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 1, 1971, at 1:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Daniel Sullivan, Planner III (Zoning); Patricia Peterson, Planner II; John Sanger, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of May 27, 1971, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that a Field Trip will be held on July 22 to visit properties scheduled for consideration during the August 5 Zoning Hearing. The Commission's Regular Meeting on July 29 will probably be cancelled; however a meeting of the Plan Implementation Committee (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker and Porter) will be held that afternoon.

The Director informed the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning is preparing a draft resolution on distribution of low-cost housing in the suburbs as requested by the Commission last week. In addition, the staff is preparing a background memorandum on President Nixon's recent statement on the subject. Both the memorandum and the draft resolution will be mailed to the Commission next week.

The Director noted that the Commission had voted on June 17, 1971, to approve application CU71.25 in principle subject to specific conditions which were to be drafted by the staff of the Department of City Planning and returned



July 1, 1971

to the Commission for final review on July 1. During the interim, the staff of the Department of City Planning had been with the applicants and had prepared six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which had been prepared for review by the Commission.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), read and commented on the conditions which were being recommended.

Thomas Feeney, Attorney for the applicant, indicated that the conditions being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be acceptable to his client.

The Director recommended that the conditions be approved by the Commission for inclusion in Resolution No. 6727 which was adopted on June 17, 1971 to approve application CU71.25.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter arrived in the meeting room and assumed her seat at the Commission table.

LM71.2 - Consideration of proposal to designate the Donaldina Cameron House, Northeast corner of Sacramento and Joyce Streets, as a Landmark.  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of June 17, 1971)

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, remarked that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board had initiated designation of the Cameron House as a Landmark on the grounds of its historical merit; and he indicated that he was prepared to recommend that the designation of the building as a Landmark be approved based on the building's long association with Donaldina Cameron and her humanitarian work in Chinatown under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church. He also noted that Reverend Wichman, the Director of Cameron House, had been present at the Commission's meeting on June 17 and had stated that the owners of the building were in favor of the proposed designation.

Don Stover, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, remarked that the ordinance which had established the Landmark's program in San Francisco had specified that a building may be designated as a Landmark for either architectural or historical reasons. Mr. Stover also remarked on the fact that very few people approach the Landmarks Board with a request that their buildings be designated as Landmarks; and, since designation of the subject building had been requested by the Donaldina Cameron House, he hoped that the designation would be approved by the City Planning Commission.

Commissioner Mellon asked if a building to be designated as a Landmark must have certain outstanding architectural features or if activities which may have taken place in the building would be sufficient to justify its designation as a Landmark. The Director replied that history itself may be an important enough factor to warrant designation of a building as Landmark even though the building



July 1, 1971

may have no architectural merit or distinction. However, since the present ordinance leaves room for a number of questions with regard to the designation of buildings on purely historical terms, he indicated that he planned to meet with members of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board in the near future to discuss the matter in greater detail.

Commissioner Fleishhacker pointed out that any buildings which have been designated as Landmarks cannot be altered without the specific approval of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and the City Planning Commission; however, when the designation is proposed for historical rather than architectural reasons, as in the present case, it did not seem to him that changes in the building, or even construction of an entirely new building would make a great deal of difference since it is the site rather than the building which is significant.

Ralph Mead, Planner III - Zoning, remarked that neither the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board nor the City Planning Commission would be likely to forbid alterations or even reconstruction of the subject building if it were to be designated as a Landmark.

Mrs. Enio Ng Lim, Administrative Secretary at the Cameron House, advised the Commission that the existing building had been constructed with bricks which were salvaged from the earthquake and fire of 1906.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Cable Car Barn had been designated as a Landmark; and she felt that designation of that building as a Landmark must have been based on historical factors rather than on architectural merit.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6729 be adopted and that the proposal to designate the Donaldina Cameron House as a Landmark be approved.

Discretionary review of Building Application No. 393840 for Tishman-Cahill building, Southwest corner of Market and First Streets.

The Director announced that the scheduled discretionary review of the building application for the Tishman-Cahill building would be postponed until the Commission's meeting on July 15, 1971. He indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had already completed its review of the building plans; however, the design of the proposed tunnel for public access from the site to the Montgomery Street transit station had not yet been worked out to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. Since the tunnel would be the basis of one of the bonuses being sought by the applicant, the Commission's action on the building application would have to await a resolution of the tunnel design issue.



Consideration of Guidelines for Redevelopment

(Postponed from meeting of June 24, 1971)

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, remarked that the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning on this matter had been mailed to members of the Commission on June 2, 1971, in the form of a memorandum entitled "Recommended Guidelines for Future Redevelopment Projects." The matter had been scheduled for the meeting of June 24, 1971; however, at the request of the Redevelopment Agency, the discussion had been postponed until today's meeting.

M. Justin Herman, Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency, read and submitted the following prepared statement:

"Thank you for providing me with a copy of your report, Recommended Guidelines for Future Redevelopment. I also appreciate that formal consideration of the report by the Planning Commission was postponed until my return.

"I consider the current report to be an improvement over the earlier draft in terms of format and the text material preceding the guidelines themselves, although, as you indicated in your letter of June 21, there still remain areas of disagreement.

"The proposed guidelines establish restraints for the narrow use of the redevelopment process at the very time when we should be using its potential for flexibility in providing a range of benefits to serve multiple needs. The Redevelopment Agency is an advocate of the well balanced city. Where so flexible a tool as the process it employs is available to a city which elects to control the direction and substance of its own development with such facilities as job resources, parks, playgrounds, health facilities, schools, cultural institutions, traffic and parking solutions, aids to the city's economy, tax base, etc., under conditions of thoughtfully evolved urban design, such capacity should not be constricted to a problem of the moment.

"Certainly there is a need to provide good housing which may be used by moderate- and low-income families with children. In fact, the Agency's current production program is primarily for such households. It is my judgment, however, that the guidelines place undue emphasis on the magnitude of such housing in future renewal areas. A balanced program of housing for all income groups (market rate, subsidized private, and public) and for all household types (families with and without children, and single persons of all ages) is essential if San Francisco is to avoid the fate of some Eastern cities.



July 1, 1971

"I would welcome not the tacit but the active support and declaration of policy sought by the Redevelopment Agency of diminishing as much as we can the subsidization of the structures of housing for residents by social categories and the building of good quality housing with subsidization of the households as necessary. This would indeed be a social advance. I have no illusions that such a policy, underway in part, can be rapidly achieved, but the combined strength of the Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Agency, and other offices and agencies which may contribute to the achievement of this objective will speed the process.

"As I understand the proposed guidelines, they do not preclude a future program which, on one hand, provides for family housing in the Candlestick area of South Bayshore and, on the other, meets a need of households without children in the Central City.

"Proposals for improving housing conditions have been or are being made for the Candlestick area, Chinatown, the Main Post Office area, the Mission District and the Northern Waterfront. Until work on such proposals has proceeded further, I believe it is too early to establish guidelines. Postponement pending the formulation of broader and achievable policies will impose on our city no ill effects. In the meantime, should any proposals come forward, they can be evaluated on their own merits."

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if any of the specific guidelines which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would conflict with any programs now being considered by the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Herman replied that he felt that the proposed guidelines would restrict the role of the Redevelopment Agency to one of providing housing for low- and moderate-income families; and he felt that the City Planning Commission should realize that the redevelopment process is an extremely flexible tool which should be used to achieve a much greater variety of objectives for the City. He remarked that no "hot" projects are pending at the present time; and he noted that significant changes are now being made in the Federal Government's Financing programs. Under the circumstances, he felt that action on the guidelines which had been proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning should be postponed to enable the Commission to give consideration to the desirability of broadening rather than narrowing the role of the Redevelopment Agency.

President Newman asked if Mr. Herman could accept the critical priorities specified in the guidelines which had been drafted by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Herman replied that the guidelines would give highest priority to the construction or rehabilitation of housing for moderate- or low-income families with children; and he remarked that he could not anticipate any time in the future when the need for such housing would be satisfied. He stated that the Redevelopment Agency presently devotes a disproportionate amount of time to the housing problems of the poor; and he felt that the role of the agency should not be restricted exclusively to that problem.



July 1, 1971

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Herman how long he felt that the Commission's actions on the proposed guidelines should be deferred. Mr. Herman replied that he would be inclined to defer action on the proposals for 6 to 12 months or until such time as new organizational patterns have been established for Federal financing programs.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the organization of the Federal Government and its financing programs will never be completely stabilized; and he believed that specific guidelines for redevelopment projects should have been adopted many years ago. Under the circumstances, his principal concern was whether the guidelines which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be the best guidelines to adopt.

Mr. Herman remarked that he was of the opinion that the Redevelopment Agency is one of the City's most flexible tools for getting things done; and he did not feel that the Redevelopment Agency should be limited to projects resulting in production of low- and moderate-cost housing. To adopt guidelines which would accomplish that purpose would be similar, in effect, to adoption of guidelines which would limit the actions of the Police Department to that of traffic control.

Commissioner Mellon felt that the City Planning Commission does have a responsibility to adopt guidelines for future redevelopment projects. It seemed to him that Mr. Herman had objected to the guidelines which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning on the basis that those guidelines would establish a too narrow definition of the role of the Redevelopment Agency. In his own opinion, however, the guidelines would not exclude the Redevelopment Agency from undertaking other types of activity but would merely give priority to projects which result in the construction or rehabilitation of housing for moderate- and low-income families with children; and he asked Mr. Herman if he objected to that statement of priority. Mr. Herman replied that the document which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning did not view the City as a totality; and he pointed out that the City Planning Commission had a responsibility to take an overall view of the Community. He did not believe that provision of housing for the poor would of and by itself make the City work; and he felt that the Redevelopment Agency could perform the function of meeting some of the other objectives of the City such as middle-class housing, jobs, improved transportation facilities, etc. He urged that the guidelines which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning be broadened before being acted on by the Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Herman had commented on only one of the five guidelines which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, asked about his reaction to the other guidelines which had been proposed. Mr. Herman stated that he was primarily concerned about the first guideline which would specify that the major purpose of and redevelopment project should be construction or rehabilitation for middle-income families with children; however, adoption of any of the other guidelines could possibly cause problems in the future, also.



July 1, 1971

Commissioner Rueda felt that the guidelines should be adopted so the residents of San Francisco will have an opportunity to anticipate the type of Redevelopment which will occur in the City in the future.

Mr. Herman remarked that the Redevelopment Agency is providing more housing for low- and moderate-income families than any other public or private agency in the City; and he did not feel that adoption of the guidelines would significantly affect that situation. However, the guidelines could be used as the basis of court suits which would cost the Redevelopment Agency millions of dollars.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the guidelines might have saved the Redevelopment Agency from a number of court suits if they had been adopted four or five years ago.

Mr. Herman believed that the guidelines, if adopted, would be used in the courts as evidence against some of the current programs of the Redevelopment Agency. Furthermore, the guidelines would encourage people to believe that the functions of the Redevelopment process are limited in scope; and he felt that that would be a mistake.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Redevelopment Agency had added both to the amenities and to the economic value of San Francisco; however, she felt that guidelines should be established to direct the course of Redevelopment projects in the future. Yet, since she felt that it would be a mistake for the Redevelopment Agency and the Department of City Planning to be at cross-purposes, she felt that action should be postponed to enable Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Herman to determine whether a compromise can be reached.

President Newman asked how long a delay would be needed. Mr. Herman suggested that action be postponed for 30 days.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that Mr. Herman had originally requested postponement from 6 to 12 months or until such time as the organization of Federal financial programs had become stabilized; and, since Mr. Herman was now willing to accept postponement of only one month, he had assumed that Mr. Herman's real objective was to achieve substantial changes in the guidelines. Mr. Herman agreed that the proposed guidelines would have read much differently if written by the Redevelopment Agency; and, although he would prefer that action be deferred by the Commission for 6 months or a year, he would be willing to have the matter rescheduled for consideration after 30 days. Mr. Herman stated that guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5, as drafted by the staff of the Department of City Planning, would be more or less acceptable to him; however, he did not feel that the activities of the Redevelopment Agency should be concentrated to the extent which Guideline No. 1 would require. In effect, he felt that the guidelines would be more appropriate if they were to be applied to the Housing Authority rather than to the Redevelopment Agency since the Housing Authority has the power to accomplish most of the stated objectives.



July 1, 1971

Commissioner Ritchie asked if Mr. Herman was concerned about the guidelines because of a belief that they would prohibit the Redevelopment Agency from becoming involved in Commercial Developments. Mr. Herman replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Porter asked if projects such as the Golden Gateway could be undertaken in the future if the guidelines were to be adopted. Mr. Herman replied in the negative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the guidelines would not prohibit any specific types of development. The only thing they would do would be to give some types of development higher priority than others.

Mr. Herman remarked that principles and policies, once adopted, often have a tendency to come back and haunt us.

The Director stated that the proposed guidelines would not narrow the scope of activities in which the Redevelopment Agency might be involved; and, in fact, he noted that the memorandum which had been distributed to members of the Commission had emphasized the advantages of the Redevelopment Agency's capacity for flexibility. What adoption of the guidelines would do would be to establish priorities for local needs and to point out the role which the Redevelopment Agency could play in satisfying those needs. At the present time, the highest priority need is for housing for low- and moderate-income families; and that fact had been reflected in the guidelines. However, as circumstances change, the guidelines could be changed, also. Furthermore, adoption of the guidelines would not prevent the Redevelopment Agency, the Housing Authority, the City Planning Commission and the Mayor's office from working together to achieve a balanced program of housing for all income groups.

The Director noted that the written statement which had been read by Mr. Herman had remarked that proposals for improving housing conditions had been or are being made for the Candlestick Area, Chinatown, the Main Post Office Area, the Mission District and the Northern Waterfront; and the suggestion had been made that it would be too early to establish guidelines until work on such programs had proceeded further. He remarked however, that the whole point of adopting guidelines would be to avoid in the future ad hoc review of projects to which the Redevelopment Agency has already been committed. And it was because he was aware that several possible projects are now being considered by the Redevelopment Agency that he thought it would be important to take action on the guidelines as quickly as possible.

While Mr. Herman had expressed a fear that individuals or groups would use the guidelines to exploit the Redevelopment Agency for their own advantage, he pointed out that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been extremely careful not to question any decisions which had been made previously with regard to the selection of Redevelopment projects. Furthermore, while adopted principles and policies may indeed come back to haunt us, no guidelines would ever be adopted for anything if one were to take the threat too seriously. While he felt



that it was quite possible that there would be no wholehearted agreement between Mr. Herman and himself on the proposed guidelines after the expiration of a 30-day period of postponement, he indicated that the postponement would be acceptable to him.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that it did not seem to him that Mr. Herman and the Director were really significantly far apart in their thinking; and he was confident that the first of the proposed guidelines could be reworded so that it would not appear to exclude the Redevelopment Agency from participating in activities other than those leading to provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried unanimously that further consideration of the guidelines be postponed for 30 days (August 5, 1971).

At 2:35 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for the scheduled zoning hearing. Commissioner Finn joined the Commission at this time.

CU71.27 - The block bounded by Everson and Digby Streets; and five lots on the southwest side of Everson Street opposite the southernmost portion of the block bounded by Everson and Digby Streets.

Request for a Planned Unit Development for approximately 86 single-family dwelling units on individual lots housing less than the minimum lot area and with less than the minimum lot width permitted under the City Planning Code; in R-1 and R-3 Districts.

(Postponed from the meetings of June 1 and 17, 1971).

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from William C. Rosso, Director of Architecture and Urban Design for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, requesting that hearing of the subject application be postponed indefinitely pending review of a revised proposal with neighboring property owners. The Secretary also called attention to a letter which had been received from Mortimer H. Herzstein, Attorney for property owners in the area, acquiescing in the proposal for postponement with the provision that he and his clients be given at least 2 weeks notice before any future hearing on the matter.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), recommended that hearing of the application be postponed indefinitely.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject application be postponed indefinitely.

CU71.26 - 2598 Geary Boulevard, northeast corner of Presidio Avenue.

Request for conversion of an existing automobile service station to an automatic automobile wash; in a C-2 District.

(Postponed from the meeting of June 3, 1971).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular lot with frontages of 159.9 feet on Presidio Avenue and



138.5 feet on Geary Boulevard with a total area of 22,159 square feet. The applicants proposed to replace the gasoline service station presently occupying the site with an automatic automobile wash and gasoline dispensing facility. Mr. Steele noted that Geary Boulevard is both a major thoroughfare and a major transit street in the Richmond-Western Addition corridor. The area of Geary and Masonic extending eastward to the intersection of Presidio Avenue is a complex and highly congested area. A current proposal to remedy the situation is to place Geary Boulevard in an underpass under the Masonic Avenue intersection. This structure would extend past Presidio Avenue and the subject site, thus reducing congestion in the area. The subject site would still have access to Geary Boulevard via the surface street which would parallel the proposed underpass.

Jerry Taylor, one of the owners of the Cloud Burst Car Wash, displayed a rendering of the proposed facility which had been prepared by an architect in Portland, Oregon. He stated that entrance to the lot would be gained from Presidio Avenue; and automobiles would exit onto Presidio Avenue after passing through the car wash. He stated that a free exterior car wash would be offered to purchasers of gasoline on the site; however, no vacuuming or other services would be provided. In terms of operation, the proposed facility would be similar to the one which presently exists at Bay Street and the Embarcadero.

President Newman asked if the facility at Bay Street and the Embarcadero is operated by the present applicant. Mr. Taylor replied in the negative but indicated that he does presently operate a similar facility in the City of Novato.

Commissioner Mellon asked if he were correct in understanding that no vehicular entrance or exit would be provided on the Geary Boulevard frontage of the site. Mr. Taylor replied that entrance to the site would be provided from Geary Boulevard for the exclusive use of the Standard Oil gasoline delivery truck which is too large to be turned around on the property. That entrance to the site would remain chained except when deliveries were being made.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

President Newman asked if the conditions would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Finn recommended that condition No. 2 of the draft resolution be changed to specify that the Geary Boulevard gateway should be used only for the gasoline supply truck and for emergencies because more intensive use of that driveway might interfere with the operation of the number 38 bus line.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if it were clearly understood by the applicant that condition No. 6 of the draft resolution would provide that no sign could be installed on the site without the prior approval of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative, and indicated that the design of any signs proposed for the site could be modified to the satisfaction of the staff of the Department of City Planning.



After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6730 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution as modified.

CU71.30 - 1400 Mission Street, northwest corner of Tenth Street.

Request for an automatic automobile wash; in a C-3-G District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is a rectangular lot with 180 foot frontage on Mission and 160 foot frontage on Tenth Street for a total area of 28,800 square feet. The property is presently used as a parking lot; and the applicant proposed to construct an exterior automatic car wash and gasoline dispensing facility on the site. Mr. Steele remarked that the City Planning Code had only recently been amended to allow automatic car washes as conditional uses in the C-3-G zoning district; and he stated that the subject application was the first request to be considered by the Commission for an automatic car wash in that zone. He also remarked that Mission Street is a major transit street regularly carrying Muni bus lines 9, 11, 12, and 14; and at the present time, additional bus lines have been routed through the area because of construction disruption on Market Street.

Michael Ohleyer, attorney for the Herbst Estate, owners of the subject property, remarked that it was not surprising that the subject site was the first C-3-G property to be considered for a conditional use car wash since he had given strong support to the code amendment which had allowed automobile washing to be considered for conditional use authorization in the zoning district. He displayed a rendering which had been prepared of the proposed project and expressed confidence that the proposal would conform with the guidelines which had previously been established by the Commission for review of conditional use car wash applications.

President Newman inquired about the location of automobile entrances to the site. Mr. Ohleyer replied that both Tenth Street and Mission Street would have one entrance to and one exit from the site.

Eric Altree stated that he is employed by the Wells Fargo Bank which serves as administrator of the Herbst Estate. He informed the Commission that the Herbst Estate has significant real estate in the immediate vicinity of the subject site; and he felt that the area could be developed much better in the future if the properties were to be retained in single ownership. While the proposed automobile car wash would be an interim use of the subject site, he noted that Mission Street, as a major arterial, does generate a need for service station and car wash facilities; and, to a lesser extent, the same thing is true of Tenth Street which serves as a major arterial for people going to the Peninsula and the Bay Bridge. Vehicles wishing only gasoline service could both enter and leave the site by way of Mission Street; however, all vehicles taking advantage of the car wash would have to exit onto Tenth Street. He stated that the proposed car wash



July 1, 1971

facility would have the most modern equipment available; and, as a result, the noise produced by the facility would be at a minimum. Furthermore, the car wash would be located as far from Mission Street as possible on the site. While both the Interdepartmental Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) and the Municipal Railway had raised objections regarding the loss of the bus stop on the south east corner of the site to make way for an automobile driveway, Mr. Altree informed the Commission that a new and larger bus stop could be provided in front of the adjacent property on the west which is also owned by the Herbst Estate. Although he had been advised that the staff of the Department of City Planning wished to recommend certain adjustments in the site plan, he believed that the plan had ample merit and that it should be approved.

A gentleman from the audience stated that he presently operates a parking lot on the site; and he indicated that he had made investments in the property which would be lost if the subject application were to be approved. In any case, he felt that the subject property should be developed with a high-rise building which would bring additional taxes to the city rather than an automatic car wash which is not needed in the area and which would be unattractive.

Walter L. Knox, Central City Representative, claimed that residents of the area had not been notified of the applicant's proposal to use the subject property for a car wash; and he felt that they would be opposed to a use which would encourage more automobiles to come to the area. He emphasized the need for housing and playgrounds in the area; and he felt that the Commission should encourage construction to meet human needs.

Mr. Altree informed the Commission that the present use of the property provides work for only one employee whereas the proposed project would provide jobs for approximately 25 people.

Mr. Steele remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning is sympathetic with the need for additional housing in the City; however, he pointed out that the subject property, which is presently being used as a parking lot, could continue in that use or other non-residential uses without any control being exercised by the City Planning Commission. With certain guidelines to observe, he felt that use of the site for an automatic car wash would be appropriate; however, the site-plan which had been prepared by the applicants had reflected certain features which were not acceptable to the staff of the Department of City Planning. Therefore, the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared an alternate site plan which would provide the same number of gasoline pumps; however, major access to the site would be provided from Tenth Street rather than from Mission Street. The alternate site plan would also make it feasible to use the southern portion of the site for parking. A wall, and possibly a bench, would be installed in the area being presently used as a bus stop; and the only automobiles which would be allowed to exit from the site onto Mission Street would be cars which would receive gasoline service only. Because of objections which had been raised by the Police Department, the Fire Department, the Municipal Railway, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works, and the staff of the Department of City Planning, he had determined that



July 1, 1971

an automobile entrance to the property from Mission Street would not be desirable; and, if an exit were to be permitted onto Mission Street, he felt that it should be located as near the west property line of the site as possible so that the Muni buses would have at least 120 feet of curb space for unloading.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved only if modifications were made on the applicant's plan to make it more consistent with the preliminary plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. If the Department's plan were not considered to be acceptable by the applicant, he believed that it would not be advisable for the Commission to approve the application.

President Newman asked if the changes which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Altree stated that an alternate site plan had been prepared by the applicants which would conform in many important respects with the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, since ingress from Mission Street was considered vital to the success of the project, an entrance driveway from Mission Street had been included on the revised plans. He emphasized, however, that the location of that driveway would have very little effect on the bus stop which presently exists at the corner.

President Newman asked if he were correct in understanding that the applicant would not accept a condition which would prohibit access to the site from Mission Street. Mr. Altree replied that he could not accept such a condition since it would destroy the economic viability of the proposed project.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Muni Railway was irrevocably opposed to having a driveway entrance to the site from Mission Street. Commissioner Finn stated that the subject corner is a major transfer point for the Municipal Railway at the present time; however, through discussion with the Manager of the Municipal Railway, he had determined that all bus stops at the corner may be abandoned after completion of the Civic Center underground station. He then asked for an indication of the minimum time in which the project might be completed and ready for operation. Through discussion with the applicants it was determined that the Car Wash could not be in operation for at least eight months. Commissioner Finn then advised the Commission that the Municipal Railway would temporarily object to use of an entrance driveway into Mission Street to the site; however, a driveway for egress purposes would seem to be no problem whatsoever.

Mr. Steele stated that the matter had been discussed at an ISCOTT meeting two weeks ago; and, at that time, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works, Police Department, the Fire Department and the Department of City Planning had expressed opposition to the entrance driveway on Mission Street. Furthermore, while future rerouting of the No. 47 bus line might result in the elimination of a bus stop on Tenth Street at the subject intersection, he suspected that the bus stop on Mission Street would continue to be important.



Commissioner Finn stated that he had been advised by the Manager of the Municipal Railway that it was extremely likely that the stop on Mission Street, also, would be abandoned.

Mr. Steele felt that the bus stop would continue to be needed, particularly if a high-rise building were to be constructed on the subject property or on other sites in the immediate vicinity in the future. In any case, he pointed out that vehicles traveling eastbound on Mission Street could gain access to the subject site by turning left on Ninth Street, left again on Jessie Street, and then left on Tenth Street.

Mr. Altree remarked that motorists who are unfamiliar with the area might not be able to figure out that route.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that Jessie Street between Ninth and Tenth Streets is partially in private ownership; and, in fact, if that property were to be developed, the access route mentioned by Mr. Steele would not be available.

President Newman felt that the matter should be taken under advisement.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Rueda that the matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of August 5 to allow the applicants and the staff to hold discussions to determine whether a compromise could be agreed upon regarding the question of ingress and egress driveways on Mission Street.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to take the matter under advisement until the meeting of August 5, 1971.

CU71.29 - Embarcadero Center, the block bounded by Clay, Davis, Sacramento, and Front Streets.

Request for a parking garage with approximately 700 off-street parking spaces on four underground floors proposed as part of a 33-story office and commercial development; in a C-3-O District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which contains 75,350 square feet of lot area. He indicated that an office is proposed to be constructed on the site under the auspices of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; and, in order to meet the Redevelopment Plan requirement for one parking space for each 1,000 square feet of office space, an underground parking garage with spaces for 697 cars had been proposed to serve the building. Ramps to and from the garage would be located on Front and Davis Streets. Mr. Steele stated that no off-street parking is required for commercial uses in the C-3 zoning district in recognition of the compact and congested nature of the Downtown area, the accessibility of the area by public transit, and programs for provision of public parking facilities on an organized basis at specific locations. However, off-street parking is allowed as an accessory use if the parking area does not exceed 7% of the total gross floor area of the building and may be authorized as



July 1, 1971

a conditional use if a greater percentage of floor area of a building is involved. The subject application had been filed because the proposed parking garage would exceed 7% of the total gross floor area of the proposed office building.

William Rosso, representing the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, requested that the application be approved.

No one else was present to speak in support of or opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to two specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which had been prepared for consideration by the Commission.

President Newman asked if the conditions would be acceptable to the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Rosso replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6731 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioner Fleishhacker abstained from discussing or voting on the matter because he holds an interest in property located across the street from the subject site.

ZM71.10 - 1540 Newhall Street, northwest corner of Quesada Avenue.  
R-1 to an R-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to Zoning maps to describe the subject property which has frontages of 100 feet on Newhall Street and 50 feet on Quesada Avenue for a total lot area of 5,000 square feet. The property is presently occupied by a large single-family dwelling; and the applicants had requested that the property be reclassified from R-1 to R-2 so that the existing building could be used as a home for six mentally retarded persons.

Germaine Sharman, one of the owners of the subject property, stated that the house had been rented out on several occasions with unhappy results; and she indicated that while the house had been rented to only three adults and three children during the final occupancy, she had later found out that almost twice as many people were living in the building. Subsequently, she had received a telephone call from a real estate agent asking if she would allow the building to be rented as a nursing home; and she had indicated that she would be willing to rent the house for such a purpose if approval could be obtained from the City Planning Commission.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or opposition to the subject application.



Mr. Steele remarked that the subject property is located adjacent to property which is already zoned R-2; and, as a result, approval of the subject application would result in a logical extension of an existing R-2 district. He also felt that the large dwelling occupying the site could be converted for R-2 use in an appropriate fashion. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6732 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CU71.32 - 1939 and 1943 - 19th Avenue, west line, 229 feet south of Ortega Street.

Request for expansion of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music through use of existing dwellings on the two subject properties as practice space for students; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject properties which have a 53 foot frontage on 19th Avenue and a total area of approximately 1,369 square feet. The properties are presently occupied by single-family dwellings which are used as a residential care home. The applicant, the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, proposed to convert the existing dwellings into music practice rooms for use by its students. Mr. Steele stated that an "institution of higher learning" is permitted as a conditional use in an R-3 district; and, although Art or Music schools are not permitted in an R-3 districts, the City Attorney's office had informally advised the staff of the Department of City Planning that the San Francisco Conservatory of Music may be considered as an institution of higher learning since it offers a Bachelor's degree.

Adolf Rosekrans, architect for the applicant, introduced several individuals who intended to speak in support of the application.

Milton Salkind, President of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, stated that students of music must practice from four to six hours a day; and, since the amount of practice space available to the school is severely limited, it was hoped that the subject application would be approved so that the houses occupying the two subject lots could be converted into practice rooms to be used from 8:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. each day. If the Commission wished to restrict use of the room to the hours between 9:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., such a limitation would be acceptable to the Conservatory.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the noise produced in the practice rooms might easily become a problem for the neighborhood; and, since both of the subject properties, as well as a third property which is located immediately adjacent to the property owned by the Conservatory, are under the same ownership, she wondered why the two lots most remote from the Conservatory rather than the two lots nearest the Conservatory had been included in the subject application. Commissioner Fleishhacker shared Commissioner Porter's concern.



July 17, 1971

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the vacant lot on the south side of the property owned by the Conservatory is in deplorable shape and he hoped that the Conservatory would make an effort to improve its appearance.

President Newman asked how long the Conservatory intended to remain in its present location, thus requiring use of the subject buildings for practice rooms. Mr. Salkind replied that the Conservatory would continue its operations on the subject site for at least five more years or until such time as more money is available for construction of a new facility.

Commissioner Ritchie repeated the question previously raised by Commissioner Porter as to why the two particular properties had been chosen, thus leaving an occupied residential home between the Conservatory and the practice rooms. Mr. Rosekrans stated that the lease arrangements which had been worked out had been acceptable to both parties involved; however, he did not know the reasons for the arrangement.

Mr. Snyder, Dean of Students for the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, stated he had talked with a number of neighboring property owners regarding the proposed project; and all of the individuals with whom he had spoken had expressed concern about parking problems in the area; however, several of the people had indicated their support for the Conservatory and its proposals. No complaints had been received regarding noise. With regard to parking, he felt that it might be possible for the Conservatory to require the registration of all student and faculty cars beginning next semester.

Mr. Rosekrans submitted a letter which had been prepared by Mr. Salkind which explained that the new practice room space would not imply an expansion of the student body of the school. The letter also indicated that the Conservatory had engaged the services of an acoustical engineer to offer proposals for lessening the noise level emanating from the practice facilities; and, in addition, the letter stated that the Conservatory was prepared to take steps to solve the parking problem which exists in the neighborhood.

David Walsh, acoustical consultant for the applicant, summarized and submitted the results of a survey which he had made of the two buildings. He stated that the practice rooms would be used only by piano, woodwind, violin and voice students; and his survey had been based on those instruments being played at "fortissimo" level. He had determined that the piano noise would be audible outside of the buildings, but not to any significant extent; and, if any of the neighboring property owners were overly sensitive to such noise, double-glazed windows could be installed.

Mr. Rosekrans remarked that the Conservatory holds only a five-year lease on the subject property; and, in the meantime, the Conservatory will be soliciting contributions for an expansion or relocation project. He did not believe that use of the existing buildings for practice rooms would have any more impact on the



July 1, 1971

neighborhood than if someone living in the houses were to give piano lessons on the premises; and, if noise should prove to be a problem, the Conservatory would seek further advice from its acoustical consultant.

Carl A. Hubbard, 1937 20th Avenue, stated that he was most concerned about the parking situation in the subject neighborhood. He stated that students from the Conservatory often park in private driveways in the area; and he felt that the Conservatory could at least use the vacant lot on the south side of its building for parking.

Mrs. Margaret O'Neil, 1936 20th Avenue, stated that music is often being played in the Conservatory until 11:00 p.m. or midnight; and she indicated that she is often bothered by the noise, particularly when her bedroom windows are left open. Parking is an even worse problem. When students park in her driveway, the Conservatory indicates that it is not able to do anything; and, as a result, she has to phone the police to have the cars towed away. Furthermore, the Conservatory had refused to be concerned about the fact that some of its students were recently living on the streets of the area in vans.

Francis Dubose, 1915 20th Avenue, stated that he was aware that he does not own curb side parking space in front of his house and that any one who wishes may park there; however, he did feel that the Conservatory should try to encourage its students not to park in front of driveways in the area. Since he had not been disturbed by noise from the school, except when music is played off key, he would not oppose the proposed project unless it would aggravate the parking problem in the area.

Mrs. Smith, 1932 20th Avenue, stated that her property is located immediately adjacent to the existing practice rooms at the Conservatory. At first, the noise from the practice rooms had been unbearable, particularly when students had repeated the same refrains over and over again. She had objected; and, as a result, the Conservatory had installed effective acoustical work in the building. Subsequently, the students had left the windows open in the practice rooms; and, consequently, the acoustic treatment had lost its effect. She stated that she had lived in the subject neighborhood for 17 years; and she indicated that she would object to being surrounded by music practice rooms.

Ernest B. Holdroff represented his wife, owner of property located at 1950 19th Avenue. Even though his wife's property is located across the street from the Conservatory, noise from the school can often be very disturbing, particularly at night. His wife had purchased property in the neighborhood because of its residential character; and she did not wish to see the Conservatory of Music expand in the area.

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from Sara Keyak, 1345 Ortega Street, and from James Jones, 1977 19th Avenue, in opposition to the subject application.



July 1, 1971

President Newman asked if he was correct in understanding that the enrollment of the Conservatory would increase from 125 to 130 students if the application were approved. Mr. Rosekrans replied that the proposed increase in enrollment would not be related to the subject application. The additional practice rooms would not allow or encourage any increase of enrollment; however, they would be needed to allow students who are waiting for classes to practice their instruments. He stated that the Conservatory had considered the possibility of using its vacant parcel of property as a parking lot; however, since some of the neighboring property owners had objected to the proposal, he would be somewhat apprehensive about pursuing the matter.

Mr. Steele asked several technical questions of Mr. Walsh. After Mr. Walsh had responded, he advised the Commission that he had not mentioned the possibility of open windows in his report since it has been his understanding that the windows would be permanently locked by the Conservatory. He agreed that noise problems would develop if the windows were to be opened.

Commissioner Porter asked if sound-proofing would be installed in the buildings so that people practicing in adjoining rooms would not hear each other. Mr. Walsh replied that he had not been asked to make recommendations for internal sound-proofing.

Mr. Rosekrans stated that the school's main building had not been designed as a conservatory; and he believed that it would be easier to install sound-retardant materials in the subject buildings than in the main Conservatory building.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the windows would inevitably be opened if the buildings are not equipped with air conditioning systems, asked if such systems would be installed. Mr. Rosekrans replied that the existing heating systems in the buildings would be adapted to circulate fresh air.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that use of the vacant parcel of land as a parking lot would improve the appearance of the property in addition to reducing parking congestion on the streets; and, as a result, he felt that the parking lot would be more advantageous than disadvantageous to residents of the neighborhood.

Mr. Rosekrans asked if conditional use authorization would be required from the Commission for such a parking lot. Mr. Steele replied in the negative.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the Conservatory would be willing to convert the vacant property for parking lot use if there were no objections from the neighbors. Mr. Rosekrans replied that he would have to discuss the matter with the Board of Directors of the Conservatory before answering that question.

Mr. Steele remarked that most of the objections which had been expressed had related to parking and not to the Conservatory use itself; and he noted that mention had been made of the possibility of turning the vacant property owned by



the Conservatory into a reasonably well-landscaped parking area. He remarked that the Conservatory of Music is an accepted institution in the subject neighborhood; and he reminded the Commission that the City Attorney had indicated that the use is a proper one in a residential district. Approval of the application would result in only a slight expansion in the enrollment of the student body and of the activity level of the Conservatory; and, as indicated by the applicant, the two buildings under consideration would retain their residential appearance. Furthermore, the proposed use would be temporary in nature pending complete reconstruction and probable relocation of the Conservatory. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the application be approved subject to seven specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. Before recommending adoption of the draft resolution, he amended condition No. 7 to specify that all property owned by the Conservatory should be maintained in an attractive manner.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Rosekrans objected to the portion of condition No. 6 which would require that the garage areas in the two subject buildings be retained as parking areas for use by faculty, employees and students of the Conservatory. He stated that it would be preferable from a security standpoint if the garages could be locked; and, in any case, it might be feasible to create an on-street off-street parking space for use by students or faculty members in the driveway curb cuts in front of the houses.

Mr. Steele thought that it would be even more desirable if arrangements could be made to use both the interior parking spaces and the curbside parking spaces in front of the driveways for student and faculty parking.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that none of the conditions contained in the draft resolution had made reference to use of the vacant property owned by the Conservatory as a parking lot. Mr. Steele replied that the matter had been considered by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, since some residents of the neighborhood had apparently been opposed to such a use of the property, the staff had felt that it would not be appropriate to include a condition in the resolution requiring that the parking lot be established.

Commissioner Rueda asked about the approximate number of automobiles which could be accommodated on the lot. Mr. Steele estimated that approximately 24 automobiles could be accommodated on the 59 x 150 foot lot after landscaping has been installed.

Commissioner Finn asked about the status of the lease on the main Conservatory building. Mr. Salkind replied that the building is owned by the Conservatory.

Commissioner Finn then asked if Mr. Salkind expected that the Conservatory would relocate within five years. Mr. Salkind replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker agreed with Mr. Steele that the resolution should not contain a requirement for use of the vacant land as a parking lot.



Mr. Rosekrans stated that he would be reluctant to accept such a condition; however, he would be willing to discuss the matter with the Board of Trustees of the Conservatory.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that installation of the parking lot would help to effectuate resolution No. 6 of the draft resolution which specified that the administration of the Conservatory would encourage students to use public transit to come to the college and would take effective steps to prevent conservatory students from parking on adjacent streets in a manner which would obstruct private driveways. He also noted that the conditional use authorization, if granted by the Commission, could be revoked at any time if the Conservatory should fail to observe any conditions which might be established. He then moved that the draft resolution, with the amendments which had been recommended by Mr. Steele, be adopted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Finn.

Commissioner Porter stated that she has the greatest respect for the Conservatory of Music and for the job which it is doing; however, she did not feel that the practice rooms being proposed would be compatible with adjacent residential uses. In any case, she knew that she would not want to live in a neighborhood where she would have to listen to students practicing their music lessons throughout the day. Furthermore, the proposal seemed undesirable insofar as one residential building would remain between the Conservatory of Music and the buildings which would contain the practice rooms; and she felt that the two northernmost buildings rather than the two southernmost buildings should have been selected. She also expressed doubt as to whether effective sound-proofing could be installed in the buildings.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he felt intuitively that something about the proposed project was wrong. He remarked that traffic noises in the area are bad enough already; and he felt that the noise of students practicing music would only make the situation worse. Furthermore, the problem would be compounded by the fact that a house would remain in residential use between the Conservatory and the practice buildings, inspite of the fact that all three residential properties are under the same ownership. He believed that use of the buildings as practice rooms would be contrary to the concept of the R-3 zoning district; and he was disturbed by the fact that the Conservatory had not maintained its vacant property in proper condition and that it continued to be unwilling to use the property as a parking lot. He stated that his conscience was telling him that he should not vote for approval of the application.

Commissioner Mellon suggested that it might be possible to take the matter under advisement for one month to allow Mr. Rosekrans to discuss with the Board of Trustees the questions which had been raised by the Commission regarding the choice of the two southernmost houses rather than the two northernmost houses and the possibility of using the vacant land as a parking lot.



Mr. Rosekrans stated that it would be possible to poll the members of the Board of Trustees in less than one month's time.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that use of the two northernmost houses as opposed to the two southernmost houses for practice rooms would not solve the noise problem for people living on 20th Avenue; and he indicated that most of the people who had expressed concern about the application had resided on 20th Avenue rather than 19th Avenue. In fact, the only resident of 19th Avenue who had spoken in opposition of the application had lived across the street. The parking problem was not really directly related to the subject application; and it would be up to the applicant to solve that matter in any case. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that a long delay would serve any constructive purpose.

Mr. Rosekrans stated that the Conservatory would be anxious to start using the subject buildings as soon as possible.

Commissioner Finn stated that he had understood that the owner of the three houses had stated forcefully that he wished to continue residential occupancy of the house which is located closest to the Conservatory; and, if so, the delay being proposed by the Commission would serve no purpose.

Mr. Rosekrans stated that he assumed that the owner of the property wished to continue residential occupancy of the buildings; however, he had not been involved in the negotiations.

After further discussion, Commissioner Fleishhacker withdrew his motion of approval and Commissioner Finn withdrew his second. It was then moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of July 15, 1971.

CU69-12 - Pacific Medical Center

Request for approval of Master Plan for expansion of the Medical Center.

(Postponed from Meeting of June 3, 1971)

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Clifford F. Schwarberg, Jr., President of the Pacific Medical Center, requesting that consideration of this matter be postponed until the meeting of September 2, 1971, to provide an opportunity for additional study of the plan in an effort to incorporate the thoughts of the residents' group and the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning into the Master Plan.



Minutes of the Regular Meeting

- 23 -

July 1, 1971

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that consideration of the subject matter be postponed until the meeting of September 2, 1971.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Thursday, July 8, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 8, 1971, at 7:30 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: John D. Crowley and Thomas J. Mellon, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Asst. Director of Planning - Plans and Programs; Richard Hedman, Planner V, Urban Design; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - (Zoning); William Duchek, Planner II; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Julie Smith represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Joel Tlumak, represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of June 3 and 24 of 1971, be approved as submitted.

PUBLIC HEARING ON URBAN DESIGN PLAN

President Newman welcomed the people who were present in the audience and called on Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, to make some introductory comments.

The Director summarized the work which had been done during the course of the two and one half year Urban Design Study which had culminated in the presentation of the Urban Design plan to the City Planning Commission on May 20, 1971. He stated that more than 2,500 copies of the proposed plan had been distributed throughout the community; and he indicated that more than 2,200 people had seen the multi-screen slide presentation of the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Many other people had seen the panel exhibit which has been on display in the public libraries. In addition, the Urban Design report had been the subject of extensive press and television coverage. In conclusion, the Director emphasized that only pages 13 thru 132 of the Urban Design report are proposed for adoption as part of the Master Plan.

Eunice Elton, 1333 Gough Street, read the following prepared statement:

"I live here by specific personal choice. I come to you as an individual citizen to state my support for the Urban Design Plan developed for San Francisco by staff of the Department of City Planning.



"It seems to me that many of our more notable flaps over building design and space usage in recent years stem from our absence of adequate stated policies going beyond the matter of height limits and space limitations. By the time we look at a proposed design and express approval or disgust, the property owner or developer already has both a substantial financial investment and an emotional commitment to 'his' design. We should be able to reduce the incidence and the decibels of our community crises by stating clearly the standards of good design in advance of those expenditures and commitments, as explicitly related to the needs of this City. To adopt the Urban Design Plan is to do just that.

"With respect to the specific Policies outlined in the Plan, I also offer my support. They are, in my opinion, good and clear. If adopted, they can chart the way to keep this the very special kind of city it has been.

"I urge your support for the Urban Design Plan."

Robert P. Lilienthal, One Spruce Street, read the following prepared statement:

"We've often heard the phrase: 'What this country needs is ...' To complete it by a paraphrase: 'What this city needs is someone who knows what this city needs.' The Urban Design Plan (UDP) does so, admirably, in the field of city planning.

"What is our task now? May I suggest that we should express

- 1) what we like about the Plan
- 2) what we would criticize about the Plan
- 3) what we would add to the Plan, and
- 4) what should be done with the Plan.

"I, for one, hope we have plenty of constructive criticism, for it has been wisely said that 'applause is often the echo of a platitude.'

"Having been a member of the Advisory Committee, I have great admiration for the Study Staff, headed by Dick Hedman, and, of course, for the Director of Planning Allan Jacobs. I'll confess there was a certain curiosity on my part, when the Study commenced, whether the young staff experts were as familiar with San Francisco as one would hope. A description of an 'expert' came to mind, as 'someone who knows no more than anyone else, but is better organized and uses slides.' But the speed and understanding with which the staff explored the city and became knowledgeable San Franciscans was amazing and reassuring.



"The UDP admirably fulfills its purpose. It uses lucid language and has well selected, superbly appropriate photos and drawings. Not only will it serve S.F. (if it does not suffer the political fate of other recent reports), but it should be useful to other cities and thereby reward the Federal government for its financial assistance. The principles of the Plan, derived from expressed philosophies, can contribute greatly toward responsibility in govt. for the revival of urban neighborhoods. This, of course, assumes implementation.

"What, specifically, do I like about the Plan?

That it is concerned with both preservation and development.

That it acknowledges that urban design is inseparable from economic and social vitality.

That it will inform architects, builders, developers of guidelines considered important to the community. (In this Age of the Curious, popularity could have been more readily acquired by simplistic solutions such as that proposed by a certain someone for publicity, which ridicules the need for economic viability per se and would move guidelines from the Planning Dept. to the ballot box.)

That the Plan concerns itself with quality in urban design.

That it defines some Fundamental Principles for Major New Development (p.80).

That it proposes an original bulk-measurement guideline for large structures (p. 94).

That it contains some excellent proposals for protecting residential areas from traffic while making them more attractive (p. 126).

That it recognizes the emptiness of the blank wall treatment, exemplified by the College for Women dorm, the Hall of Justice, the Telephone Co. bldg. on Pine St., and some of the garages in the Golden Gateway (p. 86).

That it supports and urges establishment of a Golden Gate National Recreation Area. (p. 145)

"What would I criticize about the Plan? Mostly that it does not go far enough in some of its proposals.

Sign control should be more restrictive. Signs on Union St. and Girardelli Square are examples of taste and self control.

Users of signs should be required to prove a correlation between the size and obtrusiveness of signs and resulting business volume. Billboards are designed to distract; they should be barred from view areas, including the Bayshore Freeway where Twin Peaks and other vistas could be enjoyed.

There is little reference to the pluralism of S.F. The variety of ethnic character should be preserved where it is significant. Attractive, unique, or historical facets should be maintained, not only to foster pride within a neighborhood, but to create interest in it by others.



There could be more awareness of the relationship of S.F. to the region. There is no map, even, of the Bay Area.

More emphasis could have been placed on the preservation of landmark buildings. The designated 40 are too few; protection laws need strengthening, and the economic rights of the owners must be established in detail.

The need to speed the undergrounding of utility wires and boxes is underemphasized (p. 118). The poles and boxes are a hideous blight.

Do we really want to encourage the principle of tall buildings on the hills? Perhaps, but very selectively, lest the Plan is taken to encourage high-rise apartments in presently single-family zoned areas. The wording should be carefully precise.

There is little mention of the need for improved circulation of people and goods. The traffic problems will not disappear and it should be recognized that properly located and designed elevated roads can provide spectacular views to countless motorists. Autos do not belong in long tunnels in S.F. (of course neighborhoods and static views must be protected, as a major condition).

"What might be added to the Plan?

Trees and landscaping on the barren tops of Twin Peaks.

Street hardware should be designed, including various combinations of benches, mailboxes, trash containers, alarm boxes, lights, newsstands, etc., especially on Market St. and the downtown area.

"We've come here tonight - hopefully - not to praise Caesar, but not to bury him, either. Let us see that the fine work contained in the Urban Design Plan does not suffer the probable fate of other recent reports. The most important comments I believe can be made on the UDP now concern implementation. That may be a polite term for 'enforcement', but the basic problem is whether this is to be just another report, formally incorporated into the Master Plan, and just as easy to toss aside under covert political pressure, and susceptible then only to organized militancy. I am indeed a paranoid about the lack of legal status of the Master Plan, but I have a bloody head, you will admit.

"In office buildings, the developer confronts City Hall with his 'need' for efficiency and maximum profit (which he calls, 'reasonable profit'). Even the revered Mies Van Der Rohe had the reputation for maximizing. Sometimes we are additionally faced with the developer's and architect's desires for high visibility, literally a desire to profit by disharmony. The loss of jobs and tax return, under the PR syndrome of 'all or nothing', or the political payoff, lurk behind the decision. Mr. Jacobs has been able to win some modifications from origi-



nal plans, it is true, but there have been some losses. The 25-storey Embarcadero Center has been increased 9 floors, one hears. The Golden Gateway apartments were allowed additional height. The acceptance of the Transamerica obelisk would have been in violation of the proposed Policies 1,2,5,7, and 8 on page 91, had they been in the Master Plan. But of what value would they have been if they had not been formally adopted by the Board of Supervisors?

"The Master Plan - I learned in the fight over the Presidio school - is not legally binding even on the Commission. I am pleased to find many references in the UDP which might have guided the Planning Commission and staff to have rejected approval of the contested site in the Presidio as an inappropriate use - unofficially. During the two years that matter was before the Planning Dept. the Master Plan contained similar policies against construction in park-designated zones, but the principle was accepted only at the end of the struggle.

"So I would hope the Commission will formally adopt the UDP as firm policy and then request the Board of Supervisors to approve certain finite parts of it, and of the Master Plan, so that they become legally binding. If that is not done, the public is lulled into a false sense of dependence on the Plan's expressed policies. We need government by laws; not by men. We don't want the uncertainty of developers bidding for property under expected limits only to find that a firm which outbid them is allowed a more dense, ergo, profitable, development.

"The problem of implementing the fine policies expressed in the Plan is not just to expect that education will beget compliance, but to incorporate as many of the appropriate standards as possible into law. To do less would be to mislead the people, many of whom, like myself, find it difficult to remember which decisions of each public body establish a legal decision and which merely express a transitory opinion.

"The Urban Design Plan is a superb one. I trust you will establish much of it as law."

Leon Traistar, 98 Cervantes Blvd. expressed strong support and enthusiasm for the intent and content of the Urban Design Plan Report and indicated that he was particularly pleased by the bulk guidelines which were being proposed. However, since height limits in the Downtown district would be governed by a floor area ratio, he wondered how it would be possible to preserve important view corridors along streets such as California and Pine. He remarked that the new Pacific Gas and Electric building, which is not terribly tall, effectively blocks out the view along Bush Street towards the bay; and he felt that the Urban Design Plan would have a serious flaw if it contained no provisions for the preservation of the view corridors in the future.



Henrik Bull, 350 Pacific Avenue, identified himself as a member of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee. He expressed 100% support for the proposals in the plan; and he remarked that some of our recent city "disasters" might not now exist if the Urban Design Plan had been in effect for the past 10 years. Yet, he was concerned about whether or not the staff proposals would be given "teeth". He recalled that the City Planning Commission had previously adopted certain design policies for the Portsmouth Corridor; yet, when a proposal was made for construction of the Transamerica building in that area, the Commission had completely forgotten about its policies. He felt that the principles and policies expressed in the Design Plan should be enacted into law to protect the citizens of San Francisco against damaging new construction in the future.

During the course of Mr. Bull's statement, Commissioner Rueda arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commissioner table.

Peter Mendelsohn, 117 - 4th Street, represented TOOR, the Peoples Action Coalition, and the Northern California Housing Coalition. He indicated that he agreed with the statements of the previous speakers; however, he felt that the most effective solution to the City's urban design problems would be to put the Redevelopment Agency and its director in their proper place. He stated that the Redevelopment Agency has destroyed more than it has improved; and it has tried to turn San Francisco into a little "New York" instead of being satisfied with what nature has given us. Furthermore, in planning the Yerba Buena Center, the Redevelopment Agency had made no provision for people. In conclusion, Mr. Mendelsohn urged that the Commission approve the Urban Design Plan and that it make every effort to assure that the policies and principles contained in the plan are carried out by the Board of Supervisors.

Walter Knox, 320 Clementina, identified himself as a Central City representative. He agreed with the statements which had been made by the previous speakers. In addition, he mentioned the necessity of retaining merchants and businesses in the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area to serve the people who live in that neighborhood. He also expressed a belief that construction of skyscrapers in San Francisco is changing the climate of the City in a drastic fashion. He felt that the major focus of the Planning Department should be to plan housing, to keep existing businesses and to "build for people".

Mrs. John Henderson, 215 Amber Street, identified herself as a member of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee. She felt that the Urban Design Report had achieved an extremely sensitive balance between the various points of view which exist in San Francisco at the present time; however, broad-based public involvement in support of the plan would be essential to the plans effectiveness. She urged that the Commission adopt the Urban Design Plan as a part of the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco.



Bruno Davis, 1130 Silliman Street, stated that he was affiliated with the Portola Heights Voters League. He expressed his appreciation to the staff of the Department of City Planning for the work which they had done in preparing the Urban Design Report.

Mrs. Morse Erskine, 233 Chestnut Street, stated that she, also, had served as a member of the Urban Design Citizen's Advisory Committee. She stated that she was enthusiastic about the results of the Urban Design Study, and she believed that the proposals of the staff of the Department of City Planning would offer the citizens of San Francisco an exciting opportunity to plan and protect their city. She emphasized, however, that only active citizen involvement would effectively assure implementation of the plan. She felt that the timing of the study had been extraordinary, particularly in view of the current interest in conservation, not only of nature but also of the City itself; and she felt that adoption of the plan would help people to achieve the goals which they consider to be most desirable. She indicated that the Citizen's Advisory Committee had agreed that the things that make life most worth living are open space, low density, and good neighbors.

Mrs. Erskine also felt that the Urban Design Plan would be of great assistance to individual neighborhood organizations because of the suggestions which it offers for residential amenities; and she advised the Commission that the residents of Telegraph Hill had already decided to review the dead-end streets in their neighborhood to determine whether any of them could be used for vest-pocket parks or for other public purposes. She noted that the staff report had recommended that the City's policies and procedures relating to street vacations should be revised and up-dated; and she hoped that the City Planning Commission would take action to implement those recommendations. She stated that she was pleased that the report had included an illustration which showed the detrimental effect which construction of a parking garage beneath Washington Square would have on that park; and she suggested that it might be desirable to include a policy in the plan which would state the desirability of reversing the previous trend of taking park space for underground garages by acquiring land for underground garages and then constructing parks on top with the garage revenues. In conclusion, she urged that the Urban Design Plan be adopted.

Sherri Thorpe, a resident of the South of Market area, stated that the City already has an over-abundance of parking lots; and she agreed with Mrs. Erskine that it would be desirable to construct parks above parking garages in the future. Also, she felt that involvement of people in the planning process should be recognized as something very important.

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Leonard E. Kingsley, President of the Montgomery Capital Corporation, a partner in the firm of Kingsley, Schreck, Wells and Company, and Chairman of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission. In the letter, Mr. Kingsley stated that he



regarded the proposed Urban Design Plan as an outstanding document; and he felt that it should be adopted as the policy of the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission as quickly as possible.

When no one else in the audience expressed an interest in speaking, the Director commented on the remarks which had been made and the questions which had been raised by previous speakers. Referring to remarks which had been made by Mr. Traister, the Director stated that the preservation of view corridors in the Downtown area should have been a major issue in San Francisco in the past; however, with the exception of two streets, California and Pine, the matter is no longer an issue at the present time since all of the other view corridors have been lost because of construction of new buildings south of Market Street. Existing view corridors along California and Pine Streets pass over property owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad; and the City Planning Commission had already taken steps to insure that those view corridors would be preserved when Southern Pacific's new office buildings are constructed. In addition, the Commission had established policies which would protect view corridors which presently exist in the Northern Waterfront. Nevertheless, the Director felt that the Commission might wish to consider the adoption of specific legislation which would address itself to the issue of preserving existing view corridors along public streets.

While the Director realized that numerous opportunities would be involved in carrying out a program of constructing parks above new parking garages in the future, he felt that Mrs. Erskine's suggestion should be given consideration. After all, progress had been made in that regard in Berkeley.

Most of the people who had spoken had expressed concern as to whether the plan would, in fact, be implemented; and he had heard similar comments from numerous people in the community as he had met with different groups to discuss the plan. He emphasized that the Urban Design Plan is not the type of plan which will become a reality overnight; on the other hand, if strong community support for the plan is demonstrated, he was confident that the elements of the plan subject to legislation would be legislated. He stated that he could guarantee that the staff of the Department of City Planning would devote itself to the implementation of the plan after it is endorsed by the Commission; however, he stressed that effectuation of the plan will ultimately depend upon the amount of support given by the Community.

With regard to the remarks which had been made by Mr. Lilienthal, the Director stated that the question of whether Twin Peaks should be landscaped or not is really one of personal opinion; and his preference was that the area should continue to remain unlandscaped. He advised Mr. Lilienthal that new street furniture is being designed for Market Street and for certain portions of Mission Street; and he hoped that the standards now being set for those streets could be adopted by the rest of the City in the future. With regard to the issue of signs, he noted that the City Planning Commission had made proposals several years ago which would have established most of the controls which are needed, but many of those recommendations had not been accepted by the Board of Supervisors. Recently,



JULY 8, 1971

however, substantial gains had been made with the adoption of a special sign ordinance for Market Street and enactment of legislation prohibiting signs high on building walls.

President Newman thanked those who were present for attending the hearing and announced that additional hearings will be held on July 14 and 21 at 7:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



DIRECTOR'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Thursday, July 14, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 14, 1971, at 7:30 P.M. in room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: John D. Crowley, and Thomas J. Mellon, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Richard Hedman, Planner V, Urban Design; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - (Zoning); William Duchek, Planner II; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Joel Tlumak represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of June 17, 1971, be approved as submitted. At this point in the proceedings Commissioner Rueda arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission Table.

PUBLIC HEARING ON URBAN DESIGN PLAN

President Newman welcomed the people who were present in the audience and called on Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, to make some introductory remarks.

The Director repeated the comments which he had made at the beginning of the public hearing on July 8, 1971.

Bob Gellert, 2232 Post Street, identified himself as a member of SPEAK and a member of the Citizens Planning Committee. He expressed appreciation to the staff of the Department of City Planning for giving the slide show on the Urban Design Plan to an audience composed of approximately 200 people who reside in the Great Highway and Inner Sunset areas; and he expressed his approval of the plan, especially as it related to the Sunset - Parkside areas and particularly as it related to the preservation and protection of residential areas. He was pleased by the fact that the report was "people-oriented" rather than "transportation-oriented"; and he remarked that "people-oriented" plans aimed at protection of existing residential areas are of critical importance. Without such plans, the City would eventually have no need for a Master Plan.



Mary A. Mullins, 1049 Stanyan Street, agreed with Mr. Gellert that the residential areas of the City should be protected. She indicated that she is a member of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council; and she informed the Commission that her organization would be prepared to submit a statement on the Urban Design Plan to the Commission during its public hearing to be held next Wednesday night.

Jack Murphy, 1405 7th Avenue, stated that he was critical of the proposal to protect residential neighborhoods by installation of traffic diverters which, while discouraging traffic from quieter residential streets, would increase the traffic load on nearby arterials. He stated he lives on 7th Avenue, which is an arterial; and he felt that it would be unfair to divert traffic from 8th, 10th and 11th Avenues onto 7th Avenue, thus improving some residential streets at the expense of another residential street. He indicated that he was opposed to increased automobile traffic on 7th Avenue not only because of noise but because of lead pollution; and he did not feel that the residents of 7th Avenue should have to face additional pollution simply to make other streets in the neighborhood more livable. He stated that he owns an automobile and enjoys using it to get out of town occasionally; but he felt that use of private use of automobiles in the City should be limited. In conclusion, he suggested that the City's traffic problems should be tackled in conjunction with efforts to solve other problems being faced by the City.

Mrs. John Macauley, 199 Edgewood Avenue, noted that a number of members of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council were present in the audience; and she advised the Commission that the Urban Design Plan would be discussed by the Council at its meeting on the next evening. Following that meeting, a statement would be prepared for submission to the Commission at its public hearing on July 21.

Marc Goldstein, 2725 Jackson Street, stated that he is employed as an architect by the firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill. He believed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had done an excellent job of preparing the Urban Design Plan; and, as a result of having worked with the staff on a specific development which is to be constructed in the Downtown area, he had found that the guidelines for major new development as stated in the Urban Design Plan are not merely academic but actually workable. He remarked that height and bulk are the critical factors which must be considered when major new developments are under review; and, while he felt that the staff had been well motivated in formulating recommendations for the height bulk limitations as stated in the report, he believed that the specific figures which had been decided upon by the staff might be subject to question. Yet, he could not suggest any better numbers to use at the present time; and he believed that a great deal of detailed study would be required to reach a completely satisfactory solution to the problem. In addition, Mr. Goldstein felt that the plan should allow for some flexibility in any procedures established for review of major buildings. He remarked that certain mitigating circumstances may arise wherein the public interest would be served by not adhering to rigid standards



and figures; and he believed that it would be desirable to have guidelines which would allow flexibility in such instances. He also envisioned an inevitable conflict between the desire for open space and slender towers as evidenced in the guidelines contained in the plan and the height restrictions which were being proposed or which already exist. In general, he supported the guidelines which had been proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, he hoped that they would be adopted with the idea of establishing procedures which will allow some give and take.

Kathleen Murphy, 1405 7th Avenue, felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning had done a marvelous job in preparing the Urban Design Plan. She indicated that she was especially enthusiastic about the conservation policies expressed in the plan; yet, she wondered how easy it really would be to preserve the open space which still exists in the City. She remarked that some of the City's open space is owned by semi-private organizations such as hospitals; and she wondered if the City Planning Commission could, in fact, exercise control over those areas. One seeming contradiction which she had found in the report was that the staff had in one place recommended that tall buildings should be constructed on the top of hills and in another place had recommended that high buildings should be constructed on flat land around Golden Gate Park; and she wondered how those two recommendations could be reconciled.

Mrs. Richard King, 2295 Washington Street, identified herself as a member of the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council. She urged the Commission to adopt the Urban Design Plan as a part of the Master Plan.

Mrs. Richard Cahn, 2140 Lake Street, identified herself as a member of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee. She stated that she had previously served on committees which turned out to be nothing but studies in frustration; and it was only after the Director of Planning had assured her that the Urban Design Committee would serve a real function that she had accepted appointment to the committee. Although she expected that people would raise objections regarding certain parts of the plan, she felt that the whole should be considered to be much more important than the individual parts; and she believed that the Urban Design Plan should be adopted and put into effect by the City Planning Commission. In fact, she felt that it would be desirable for such an amendment to the Master Plan to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Mrs. James Wiley, 1132 Union Street, believed that her home and her livelihood are wholly dependent upon the type of environment which had been outlined in the Urban Design Plan; and she indicated that she would be willing to do everything possible to have the plan adopted as a part of the Master Plan. She hoped that the Commission would also adopt strong policies directed against the vacation of public streets in the future; and, in addition, she felt that a policy should be adopted directed against construction of any additional buildings in the bay.



Arthur H. Middleton, 160 Grandview Avenue, represented the Upper Market Planning Association. He stated that his organization had not yet adopted a policy position on the Urban Design Plan; however, as an individual, he wholeheartedly endorsed the plan. He was impressed by the plan's orientation to human needs and to neighborhood livability; and he viewed adoption of the plan as a necessity. He indicated that additional information regarding the guidelines proposed for major new developments and the specific areas of the City which would be affected by those guidelines would be desirable; and he felt that more discussion of those issues should be worked into the staff's presentation of the Urban Design Report. In conclusion, he asked if any thought had been given to the possibility of giving the staff's presentation on television.

Reuel S. Brady, 130 Gilman Avenue, remarked that all of the policies in the plan appeared to have been formulated with people in mind; and, as a result, he felt that the plan should be nothing but a success. He concurred with the previous speaker that radio and television should be used to familiarize a greater number of people with the plan.

Robert Katz, 2 Whiting Place, felt that the Urban Design Plan constituted an absolutely outstanding achievement on the part of the staff of the Department of City Planning. He regarded the report as being extremely readable; and he remarked that the people who had written the report had obviously been in touch with people in the community. He was pleased with the emphasis which had been placed on the livability of neighborhoods and the organic growth of the City; however, he felt that the report should have given a little more attention to social problems. He noted that a statement on page 146 of the report, which will not be adopted as a part of the Master Plan, called for the adoption of an ordinance to govern in detail the procedures, criteria and compensation to be required for proposed street vacations, revocable permits and other methods for release of street areas; and he felt that specific criteria for street vacations should have been formulated by the staff of the Department of City Planning in the course of its work. His own suggestions were that deliberations on street vacations should give greater attention to the street's usefulness in providing light and air and its pedestrian functions than to the function of the street in handling vehicular traffic, that the Charter be amended to provide that that street vacations must result in public benefit, and that any streets to be vacated in the future should be sold for twice the value of the land rather than one half the value of the land as in the past. He remarked that a statement was contained on page 62 of the report to the effect that building of parking garages under parks can seriously lessen their natural qualities when the access ramps, air vent and elevator structures, and other changes in the park surface intrude upon the landscape. His own feeling was that no more existing parks in San Francisco should be used for underground garages; and, in fact, in neighborhoods such as Fisherman's Wharf, where there is a great need for parking space, he felt that the City should consider the desirability of constructing



an underground parking garage with a brand new park on top. He did not feel that the staff recommendation for construction of high-rise buildings around Golden Gate Park harmonized with the concepts stated elsewhere in the report to the effect that high-rise buildings should be located on the tops of hills; and he believed that some attention should have been given to the question of whether or not San Francisco should have a zero population growth. He asked if there were some contradiction between the height policies stated on page 92 of the report and the bulk policies stated on page 94 of the report. In conclusion, he stated that the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, having been given impetus by the staff report, had decided to make an inventory of the dead-end streets in their neighborhood to see if any of them could be used as parks.

Mrs. Jehl, 2239 37th Avenue, stated that she had heard rumors to the effect that street car tracks will be installed on Sunset Boulevard. She did not feel that such a project would be in keeping with the policies and principles expressed in the Urban Design Plan; and insofar as adequate public transportation is already available to residents of that area, she did not feel that destruction of the new lighting and watering systems which were installed only three years ago could be justified.

Emory Curtis, 635 Divisadero Avenue, represented PACT. He indicated that he supported the policies of preserving and enhancing the City's residential neighborhoods which contain such great diversity; and he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had demonstrated the sincerity of its convictions by working with PACT to oppose the Department of Public Works in its proposal to turn Scott and Divisadero Streets into a one way pair which would have affected both a residential street and a commercial strip. And, after that issue had been resolved, the staff of the Department of City Planning had worked with PACT to help improve the character of the commercial strip along Divisadero Street. He remarked that the existence of commercial strips is extremely important to the existence of residential neighborhoods; and, in fact, he felt that the municipal railway should orient some of its transportation lines to individual neighborhoods rather than orienting everything to downtown San Francisco. He stated that the merchants along Divisadero Street had gathered money to purchase trash cans for the street which the Department of Public Works could not afford; and he felt that the project had demonstrated that things can happen when merchants and the City work together in partnership. In conclusion, he submitted two copies of a proposal which had been formulated by PACT for a Third Street Business Climate Development Project.

Evylin Evelyn, a resident of the South of Market Area, felt that the old Mint should be made available for use by people who live in the area; and she mentioned the need for a park in that neighborhood. She also asked if any consideration had been given to construction of a new City Hall and use of the present City Hall as a museum.



JULY 14, 1971

The Director, responding to some of the comments which had been made, noted that Mr. Murphy had also written a long letter to the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he indicated that the staff was preparing a response. Mr. Murphy had been concerned about the staff's proposal for protection of residential neighborhoods by construction of traffic diverters which would keep through traffic on arterial streets rather than on streets which are exclusively residential in character; however, the only alternative to that proposal would be to leave heavy traffic on all of the City's streets. In formulating the recommendations, the staff of the Department of City Planning had not assumed that the amount of traffic on major streets would be increased. Mr. Murphy had asked if it would be possible to conserve open spaces which are presently owned by semi-public agencies such as the University of California Medical Center, the Presidio, and Forts Mason, Miley and Funston. The Director stated that the City has no legal control over properties owned by the State or Federal Government; however, the City's ability to apply persuasion has become increasingly effective. Inevitably, the effect of persuasion will depend on times, circumstances and administrations; however, the current administration of the University of California Medical Center had already expressed appreciation for the Department of City Planning's concern for perpetuation of the green belt; and, within the last year, the City had concluded a treaty with the Presidio under which any changes which are proposed for that Federally-owned property must be reviewed by the Commission for a decision as to their conformance to the Master Plan.

Mr. Murphy had also raised a question regarding a seeming contradiction between the principles emphasizing the importance of the views of open space at the top of hills versus the desirability of constructing high-rise buildings at the top of hills. However, in preparing the maps contained in the Urban Design report, the staff of the Department of City Planning had made proposals for individual hill tops on a selective basis. The maps call for retention of open space at the top of Twin Peaks and Bernal Hill, selective developments on Russian Hill and high-rise development on the top of Nob Hill. Conversely, buildings of moderate height had been proposed in certain flat areas of the City where they would not affect views. Mr. Middleton had suggested that an effort should be to give a presentation of the Urban Design Plan on a local television station. The Director stated that an effort had been made to make such arrangements before the Urban Design Plan was completed; however, none of the local television stations had expressed interest in the project. The multi-screen slide presentation which had finally been developed by the staff of the Department of City Planning would not be adaptable to television. Recently, however, an approach had been made to the Federal Government to see if they would be willing to sponsor a 30-minute movie on the Urban Design; and the reaction of the Federal Government thus far had been most receptive. If such a film were developed, it could be shown on local television stations.



JULY 14, 1971

The Director remarked that Mr. Katz had suggested that the Urban Design Study should have given more consideration to social issues. In reply, he stated that technically all the plans which are prepared by the Department of City Planning, including the Improvement Plan for Residence and the Transportation Plan, do deal with social issues; and he stated that a considerable amount of time had been spent on social issues during the course of the Urban Design Study. Mr. Katz had also emphasized the need for establishing criteria for vacation of public streets; and the Director referred him to pages 70 and 71 of the report on which appear 17 criteria for review of street vacation requests including 12 instances in which streets should not be vacated and five other instances when release of a street area might be considered favorably. The Director agreed with Mr. Katz that the height and bulk proposals contained on pages 92 and 95 of the report are somewhat contradictory and misleading; however, he stated that any established height limitations would be the controlling factor and that no buildings would be allowed to exceed those limitations. He assured Mr. Katz that the apparent contradictions in the report would be corrected.

Whereas Mrs. Jehl had questioned the desirability of installing street car tracks for the Municipal Railway on Sunset Boulevard, he pointed out that such a proposal was not contained in the Urban Design Plan. He confirmed, however, that the Municipal Railway has been considering such a project as a possible solution to a dead-head problem which will otherwise require street cars at the end of the line to travel back to downtown San Francisco before being able to return to the car barns. He stated that the staff of the Municipal Railway was convinced that the rails could be installed without tearing up any trees on Sunset Boulevard; and their proposal was now being studied by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that nothing in the Urban Design Plan would either urge or discourage such a proposal. The Director stated that the Urban Design Staff of the Department of City Planning had been pleased to work with Mr. Curtis and his organization in an effort to apply some of the principles contained in the Urban Design Report towards the improvement of Divisadero Street; and, as was the case with that project, much of the effect of the proposals contained in the Urban Design Plan would depend upon private action.

The Director stated that he had no objections to use of the old Mint by older people residing in the south of Market area; and he agreed with Miss Evelyn that there is need for additional park space in that area. He did not feel that it would be easy to accomplish her proposal for erection of a new City Hall or use of the present City Hall building as a museum; and, in fact, his personal disposition towards such a project would be negative. He felt that the character of the existing building is enhanced by the activity of people at work.



JULY 14, 1971

President Newman expressed his appreciation to members of the audience for attending the meeting and indicated that the final public hearing on the Urban Design Plan will be held on the next Wednesday night, July 21, at 7:30 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 15, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 15, 1971, at 1:30 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: John D. Crowley, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning); Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Charles Forester, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

## CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning will present its Urban Design Plan slide show to the National Council of Architecture Reviewing Board tomorrow afternoon.

The Director reminded the Commission that the final public hearing on the Urban Design Plan will be held next Wednesday evening, July 21, in Room 282, City Hall, at 7:30 p.m.

The Director noted that a Field Trip has been scheduled for 1:00 p.m. next Thursday to visit properties to be considered during the Zoning Hearing on August 5. Although the remainder of the meeting will be cancelled that day, he indicated that the Area Plans Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Fleishhacker, Porter, Rueda) will meet immediately following the Field Trip.

The Director announced that the Regular Meeting on August 29 will be cancelled. However, the Plan Implementation Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Porter) will meet at 3:30 p.m. that afternoon.

The Director stated that the President of the Commission had received a letter dated July 12, 1971, from the Commanding Officer of the Presidio requesting that the Commission adopt a resolution to express its position regarding construction of an elementary school on the Lobos Creek site in the Presidio. The Director stated that he would acknowledge the letter and advise Colonel Fellows when the matter is scheduled to be considered by the Commission.

The Director advised the Commission that he will be on vacation for three weeks beginning next Friday.



July 15, 1971

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter arrived in the meeting room and assumed her seat at the Commission table.

The Director noted that Commissioner Rueda had requested during the Commission's meeting on June 24 that the staff review President Nixon's statement on equal housing opportunity and consider drafting a resolution which the Commission could send to the Board of Supervisors for consideration as an official response from the City and County of San Francisco. During the interim, the staff had prepared two documents for consideration by the Commission. The first document was a background paper which summarized the President's statement, described relevant portions for the Plan for Residence which apply to regional housing development and equal opportunity, and, finally, which discussed the relationship between the Plan for Residence and the President's message. The second document was a draft resolution which spoke to the issue which was raised by Commissioner Rueda and recommended that the Board of Supervisors request the President to reconsider the implication of the policies set forth in his June 11th statement. The draft resolution contained two resolves, as follows:

"Therefore, be it resolved that the City Planning Commission of the City and County of San Francisco affirms its desire for a national program of affirmative action to increase housing opportunity in metropolitan areas through the equitable distribution of low- and moderate-income housing;

"And be it further resolved that the City Planning Commission requests the Board of Supervisors to memorialize the President of the United States to reconsider the policy expressed in his June 11, 1971, statement in light of the considerations expressed in this resolution."

Commissioner Ritchie suggested that the final resolve of the draft resolution should be changed to "respectfully request" the President to reconsider his expressed policy rather than to "memorialize" him to do so. With that change, he moved that the draft resolution be adopted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rueda.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the background paper which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors, also. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the concerns expressed in the draft resolution might be of concern only to San Francisco and not to other major cities in the United States since San Francisco is one of the few cities in the country which does not consist of some quasi-suburban areas.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5-0 to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Resolution No. 6773.



July 15, 1971

## R71.27 - Temporary Helistop, San Francisco General Hospital.

The Secretary stated that he had received a telephone call from the office of Dr. Curry, Director of the Department of Public Health, requesting that consideration of this matter be postponed until the Commission's next meeting on August 5. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie and carried unanimously that consideration of the referral be postponed until the meeting of August 5, 1971.

## R71.31 - Proposed lease, service station site, Laguna Honda Hospital, Portola Drive and Woodside Avenue.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The site occupied by the Standard Oil service station at Woodside Avenue and Portola Drive, just east of the Youth Guidance Center, is located on City-owned land under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health. The site has been leased to Standard Oil Company since 1937, and since April 30, 1967, has been leased on a month-to-month basis since there was a possibility that a portion of the site might be needed for construction of the proposed Portola Drive underpass at this intersection.

"The Director of Public Works has now determined that the property will not be required for the underpass or during construction, and the Director of Property proposes to invite bids for the lease of the site for a term of fifteen years for gasoline service station purposes only, the fifteen-year period being deemed the minimum for the lessee to amortize improvements to bring the site up to modern service station specifications. The Director of Public Health has no objection to the long-term lease of the property, which is separated from Laguna Honda Hospital by the Youth Guidance Center.

"The property is in the Public Use zoning district and the service station is a non-conforming use with no termination date stated in the City Planning Code. The zone was C-1 prior to the enactment of the provisions for the Public Use zone in 1962."

The Director recommended that the proposed lease of the subject site be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the Department of City Planning shall review and approve remodeling or rebuilding plans prior to the application for the building permit and that the plans shall be subject to such conditions as the Department shall deem appropriate.

Commissioner Rueda, noting that construction of the proposed Portola Drive underpass would result in a major change in the area, felt that a lease with a duration shorter than 15 years might be desirable since it would allow the city to reconsider the issue after the underpass has been constructed. Commissioner Fleishhacker agreed.



The Director remarked that the Department of Public Works had assumed that the underpass would not affect the subject property; and he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning was convinced that the Department of Public Works was correct. Yet, since no one can be positive about the actual effect of the underpass, he agreed that Commissioner Rueda's concern had merit. He had understood, however, that a period of 15 years would be needed to amortize the improvements which the Standard Oil Company intends to construct on the site.

Commissioner Fleishhacker inquired about the amount of time which would be needed for construction of the overpass. Mr. Jung replied that approximately two years would be required for that project.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Commissioner Rueda asked about the approximate expense of the improvements which the Standard Oil Company proposed to make on the subject site. The Director replied that a completely new service station would have to be constructed.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he had not understood that a completely new station was being contemplated. However, if that were the case, approval of the lease for a 15 year period would be acceptable to him.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed lease of the site at Woodside Avenue and Portola Drive, a portion of lot 7 in block 2842, for gasoline service station purposes, is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the Department of City Planning shall review and approve remodeling or rebuilding plans prior to the application for a building permit and that the plans shall be subject to such conditions as the Department shall deem appropriate.

Discretionary review of Building Application No. 393840, Tishman-Cahill Building, southwest corner of Market and First Streets.  
(Postponed from Meeting of July 1, 1971).

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"This Building Application is being reviewed pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 6111, adopted in June 1967, which calls for discretionary review of all building projects along Market Street.

"The developers are the Tishman and Cahill Construction Companies, who propose an office building on the site bounded by Market, First, and Stevenson Streets and incorporating Ecker Street at its western edge. Occupancy would reportedly include one or more major tenants. The architects are John Carl Warnecke and Associates.



July 15, 1971

"Development concepts for this site were first reviewed with the Department of City Planning two years ago, and in November 1969 the Planning Commission approved both the vacation of Ecker Street in this block and preliminary plans for the proposed building. Final approval of the building plans was withheld pending action by the Board of Supervisors upon the street vacation request, determination of the feasibility of the tunnel proposed from the site to the Montgomery Street transit station, and filing of a formal application for a site permit on the basis of more refined plans. These steps have been taken, and the Building Application is now before the Commission for its action.

"The office tower has nearly the same total floor area as that shown in the earlier plans -- 1,040,747 square feet -- but it has slightly less height: 38 stories and 529 feet rather than 40 stories and 566 feet. Because the site is open on all sides and accessible to transit, the building can make good use of the bonus system, with floor area credited for transit access, multiple entrances, sidewalk widening, shortening of walking distance, a plaza, a side setback and an observation deck.

"The largest bonus would be for construction of a tunnel for public access to the Montgomery Street transit station. This tunnel has been designed to avoid conflict with the Market Street tree wells, the large sewer crossing Market and a number of other utility lines. The developers would be required, and they have agreed, to bear the cost of relocating and reconstructing utility lines as necessary, as well as any other costs to the City and to BART resulting from the tunnel construction. In order to allow Municipal Railway service to be maintained on the street surface, the Department of Public Works is requiring that the tunnel not be built under Market Street until Muni service is moved underground in 1974. That date would roughly correspond to the time of completion of the office building. In order for the Building Application to be approved under the City Planning Code, a performance bond would have to be required of the developers to assure construction of the tunnel.

"Inclusion of Ecker Street in the site has allowed the building to be somewhat larger under the floor area ratio limits. Vacation of this street would not have been recommended to the Planning Commission in 1969, however, were it not for the fact that the City's plans for development of Market Street already called for closing of Ecker Street to traffic and its use by pedestrians. Under the office building proposal, Ecker Street would be paved with brick by the developers and kept open day and night, and the City would retain full use of the subsurface for utilities. These conditions, as provided for in the Commission's 1969 approval, have been included in the disposition agreement for the street area and would also be imposed



in approval of the Building Application. On this basis, the conditions would be irrevocable. With these conditions, the Ecker Street vacation appears to be one that would meet the stringent criteria recently proposed to the Commission in the Urban Design Plan.

As compared with the plans given preliminary approval by the Commission in 1969, the plans now before you have the following changes:

1. The plaza has been redesigned, with the assistance of landscape architects, so that there is more open space and easier movement at ground level. Provision is still made for an outdoor restaurant, and a possible pedestrian bridge over Stevenson Street in the future.
2. More continuous retail space is provided at ground level, with retail frontage on three sides of the building. The main lobby is now on the second level, reached by stairs and escalators.
3. Treatment of sidewalk areas is more fully developed, with several awkward steps removed. A turning lane for traffic on Market Street may be eliminated, allowing for a wider sidewalk and a double row of street trees.
4. The transit tunnel entrance is now east of Ecker Street, within the site but available to the public, and the tunnel runs beneath the Market Street roadway rather than beneath the sidewalk or the Standard Oil building. Standard Oil has found that its basement cannot accommodate the tunnel, and the tree wells prevent the space beneath the sidewalk from being used.
5. Access to parking remains at Stevenson Street, but the driveway has been moved and only one garage level is provided, for a total of 47 cars rather than 168 as before. The loading berths have been increased from four to six.

"For the most part, these changes can be regarded as improvements. One desirable change that has not occurred, however, is any reduction in the horizontal dimensions of the building. On its longest wall the building measures 185 feet, as compared with a length of 170 feet specified in the bulk guidelines of the Urban Design Plan. In the diagonal, the dimension is 241 feet, compared with a 200-foot limit in the bulk guidelines. Were it not for the earlier approval of preliminary plans with these dimensions, and the further development of plans in reliance upon that approval, the staff would seriously question the building bulk on the basis of the Urban Design Plan.



July 15, 1971

"If the horizontal dimensions were in fact reduced, and if the building did not become much taller, the floor area ratio would be less than the high figure of 23.6:1 produced by these plans. Although that figure is extraordinary, it is considered to be within the concepts of the downtown zoning system, due to the public amenities afforded by the bonus features, and because of the fact that this building would satisfy a significant share of the market for office space at a proper location in the center of the office core and close to a transit station.

"The staff has consistently indicated to the developers and architects that the building facades should be light in color, and of the three schemes for elevations that have been reviewed two would be light and one dark. The most recent scheme, for a predominantly dark facade, is not consistent with the guidelines given for this project.

"If approval is given to this application, it should be with the following conditions:

1. That the design of all exterior ground areas be further reviewed with the staffs of the Department of City Planning and Transit Task Force, so that the paving, landscaping, signs and other features will be consistent with and complementary to the treatment of Market Street.

2. That the precise treatment of building facades, including choice of materials, be further reviewed with the Department, in terms of compatibility with other downtown development and moderation of the appearance of bulk, and that final plans for the facade treatment be reviewed and approved by the Department. The building should be light in color and harmonize with other buildings completed or planned in the immediate area. Accordingly, the schemes marked "B" and "C" for light precast concrete and light travertine are approved in concept, while the submission marked "A1" for dark metal spandrels with dark glass is disapproved.

3. That the conditions relating to vacation of Ecker Street, as set out in the City Planning Commission recommendation of November 20, 1969, be carried out through the disposition agreement for the street vacation.

4. That final approval be given by the Board of Supervisors for construction of the tunnel to the Montgomery Street transit station that the portion of the tunnel from the stairway on the subject site to the curb line be constructed concurrently with construction of the building basement; that a performance bond be given which is sufficient in the judgment of the City Attorney to assure construction of the remainder of the tunnel from the curb line to the Montgomery Street station mezzanine; that plans for the tunnel be further refined with a view toward making the route more direct and less sloping, and in no



July 15, 1971

event less direct, more sloping or with a passageway narrower than 15 feet; and that construction of the remainder of the tunnel as aforesaid be commenced no later than 60 days following the start of underground operation of Municipal Railway cars adjacent to the subject site."

The Director recommended that the building permit application be approved subject to the four conditions which had been listed by Mr. Svirsky.

President Newman asked how much money the City had received for the vacation of Ecker Street. Mr. Svirsky replied that he did not know the answer to that question.

Commissioner Porter asked about the amount of money which would be specified in the performance bond which would have to be given by the applicant to assure construction of the remainder of the tunnel from the curb line of Market Street to the Montgomery Street station mezzanine. Mr. Svirsky replied that it was his understanding that the bond would be for performance only and would assure that the tunnel would be constructed as indicated in the plans which had been filed with the City. It would appear, therefore, that specific dollar amount would be stated in the bond.

Commissioner Rueda asked why construction of the tunnel would have to be delayed until the street cars of the Municipal Railway are operating underground. Mr. Svirsky replied that construction of the tunnel while the street cars are still operating on the surface would require the Municipal Railway to make some rather complicated changes in service; thus, a decision had been made to delay the construction of the tunnel until the street cars have been relocated underground. He indicated, however, that construction of the tunnel would be undertaken concurrently with removal of the street car tracks and resurfacing of the street.

Robert Cahill, representing the applicants, stated that the property occupied by Ecker Street had cost \$75 a square foot or approximately \$295,000 in all.

President Newman asked if the conditions which had recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Cahill replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the plans would provide for the possibility of a pedestrian bridge over Stevenson Street in the future, asked if definite plans had been made for such a bridge. Mr. Svirsky replied that construction of the bridge would ultimately depend upon the type of development to take place on the south side of Stevenson Street. In any case, any specific proposal for construction of the bridge would be subject to review by the Commission.

Commissioner Ritchie agreed with the staff that the proposed building should be light in color; however, he felt that the design of the building indicated on



submission "A-1" was superior to the design of the light colored buildings indicated on the schemes marked "B" and "C". He wondered if it would be possible to construct the building depicted on scheme "A-1" with light colored materials.

The Director felt that it might be possible for the applicants to construct the building shown in scheme "A-1" with light colored building materials. He emphasized, however, that the staff was more concerned about the color of the building than about the facade treatment which might be selected by the applicants.

Commissioner Porter asked the applicants if the condition specifying that the building must be light in color would be acceptable to them. Mr. Cahill replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Svirsky had stated that the largest bonus for the building would be for construction of a tunnel for public access to the Montgomery Street transit station, asked how much smaller the building would have been if the tunnel had not been proposed. Mr. Svirsky replied that the tunnel had allowed the developers a bonus of 96,940 square feet or the equivalent of 3.4 floors.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked if the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning would give the applicants the option to delete the tunnel and to construct a smaller building. Mr. Svirsky replied that such substantial changes in the building plans would require that a new application be filed for consideration by the Commission.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Ritchie that the draft resolution be adopted and that the plans be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Ritchie observed that the applicants had spent a great deal of time to modify their plans in accordance with the requirements of the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he felt that the final plans, with the exception of the dark color specified, would result in an outstanding building.

Commissioner Rueda asked what would happen if the Board of Supervisors should disapprove the applicants' proposal to construct the proposed tunnel. President Newman replied that such a decision by the Board of Supervisors would require that the floor area ratio of the proposed building be readjusted.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6734 and to approve Building Application No. 393840 subject to the conditions which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

At this point in the proceedings, President Newman absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting. Commissioner Porter assumed the chair.



July 15, 1971

Progress Report on Chinatown 701 Project

The Director read the following statement:

"The Commission's review of progress on the Chinatown project, calendared for today's meeting, will be put over until August 19. We have asked that this be done because the project is at the point where an additional month of work would allow the consultants and your staff to report more extensively on the findings of the project. I should also say that in recent days a number of meetings have been held with citizen representatives in Chinatown to refine various policy recommendations drafted to this point. On August 19, we will review these policies, as well as report on some specific recommendations for improving housing and recreation facilities in Chinatown.

"I would like to take a few minutes today, however, to report generally to you on the status of the project.

"As the Commission is aware, the Department began a year-long project to develop plans for housing and recreation in Chinatown around November of last year. This project grew out of a Reconnaissance Study that the Department undertook two years ago as a necessary step toward developing a comprehensive plan for Chinatown. Although there was wide community support for a comprehensive plan, and it was endorsed by the City Planning Commission, the costs of the project exceeded available City funds. Consequently the project was reduced in scope to develop a plan for Housing and Recreation, with a special emphasis on developing a program of specific actions.

"The project is financed, as you know, with Federal assistance under the 701 program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development contributed \$50,000. The local share of \$25,000 is made up of a \$10,000 grant from the San Francisco Foundation and an allocation of \$15,000 from the Board of Supervisors. The planning firm of Sedway-Cooke was engaged as consultants on the project.

"It was recognized at the outset that citizen participation would be essential to the success of the project. To this end, an advisory committee composed of representatives of various community groups and community leaders was established. This Citizens' Advisory Committee elected the Rev. Harry Chuck and Mr. Mortimer Fleishhacker co-chairmen. The committee assisted in selecting a consultant and has met monthly to review the work progress of the project. It has also established two subcommittees, one on Housing and another on Recreation to delve into issues and recommendations in more detail.

"A Technical Advisory Committee has also been established and is composed of representatives of the Housing Authority, the Human Rights



Commission, the Mayor's Office, the Recreation and Parks Department, and the Redevelopment Agency. These representatives have regularly attended meetings of the citizens' committee and sub-committees, providing information to them on specific programs and the operations of their agencies.

"Over the past six months the consultants have spent a majority of their time developing specific objectives and policies for Housing and Recreation in Chinatown, doing an inventory of facilities and land in Chinatown, making available the findings of the 1970 Census for Chinatown and examining specific sites to be included as part of the Improvement Plan for this area of the city. A series of reports has been prepared by the consultants and distributed to the Citizens' Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. On August 19th we will summarize much of this material and identify some specific recommendations that are emerging from the project.

"I would briefly note that the 1970 Census and other findings in our work up to now further support the real need for increased housing and recreation programs in Chinatown.

"The housing and recreation problems of Chinatown clearly are among the most serious in the Bay Area. Within the past ten years, several factors have compounded these problems to the point where immediate and concerted action is essential. Chief among these was enactment of the 1964 Immigration Act which had led to the addition of approximately 9,000 Chinese immigrants in San Francisco by 1969. Data tends to indicate a high concentration of these immigrants in the Chinatown core area. The largest group among the new arrivals is families in their early and middle childrearing years.

"The housing stock has not kept pace with the resulting new demands. During the period from 1960 to 1970 the population of Chinatown increased by almost 10 percent while the housing stock declined by practically the same percentage. Moreover, this was accompanied by drastic reductions in low- and moderate-income housing. The inevitable result has been a worsening of the already seriously overcrowded housing conditions. The housing problem is exacerbated further by the prevalence of substandard housing. There is some sort of code violation in two-thirds of Chinatown's housing stock. Of the 23,000 units, over 5,000 of them are classified by the Bureau of Building Inspection as having serious violations.

"The recreation conditions in Chinatown appear to be no better than the housing conditions. In the entire Chinatown/North Beach area, there are only 17 acres of open recreation land to serve 68,000 persons. Of these 17 acres, seven are school playgrounds presently unavailable on evenings and weekends.



"The amount of recreation open space and facilities has not noticeably increased in the past ten years despite the growth in the area's population. There has been a change in the composition of the population as well, with substantial increases among the young and the elderly.

"These general findings indicate the scale of the problems in Chinatown in the areas of housing and recreation. On August 19th we will present progress to date on developing policies, objectives and recommendations for action in Chinatown."

CU71.32 - 1939 and 1943 - 19th Avenue, west line, 229 feet south of Ortega Street.

Request for expansion of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music through use of existing dwellings on the two subject properties as practice space for students; in an R-3 District.

(Under Advisement from Meeting of July 1, 1971).

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Adolf Rosekrans, architect for the applicant, requesting that the subject application be withdrawn.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6735 be adopted and that the request for withdrawal of the subject application be approved without prejudice.

#### Final Consideration of Central Waterfront Recreation Sites Report

The Director stated that R. Spencer Steele, who had been in charge of this project, had been called out of town on an emergency; and, as a result, final consideration of the report would have to be postponed until the Commission's meeting on August 12, 1971.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



**DIRECTOR'S COPY**  
SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Wednesday, July 21, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Wednesday, July 21, 1971, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, President; and John Ritchie and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of July 8, 1971, be approved as submitted.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE URBAN DESIGN PLAN (a proposed Amendment to the Master Plan)

Commissioner Fleishhacker, who was chairing the meeting, welcomed the audience and called on Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning to make some introductory comments.

The Director repeated the introductory comments which he had made during the meetings of July 8 and 14. He also asked that the following listing and summary of letters which had been received by the Department of City Planning regarding the Urban Design Plan be incorporated into the minutes.

LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING REGARDING THE URBAN DESIGN PLAN

Neighborhood and Civic Organizations

East & West of Castro Improvement Club (Fred Methner)  
Upper Market Planning Association, Inc. (Arthur H. Middleton)  
The Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (T. E. Rickert)  
Eureka Valley Promotion Association (David Leash)  
Westwood Park Association (William Fogarty)  
Planning Association for the Richmond (Richard Klein)  
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association (Wes Dawe)  
Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Development Corp. (John R. Hansen)

San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (Jack Murphy)  
Northern California Chapter - The American Institute of Architects  
(Elmer Botsai)



San Francisco Tomorrow (Charles Quantz)  
San Francisco Beautiful (Mrs. Hans Klussmann)  
League of Women Voters of San Francisco (Kay Blalock)

Business and Professional

James E. Stretch (V.P. Metropolitan Life)  
Brooks Walker (V.P. North Waterfront Association)  
Edward Winer (Design Workshop)  
William H. Coibion, A.I.P. (V.P. for Planning, Leo A. Daly)  
Larry G. Wylie, A.I.P. (Director of Planning, Leo A. Daly)  
Alan Wofsy (Alan Wofsy and Associates)  
Gladys Miller, F.A.I.D.  
Philip R. Lawrence, Attorney  
Garret Eckbo (Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams)  
Chris Stritzinger (Exec. V.P. Gump's)  
Elmer E. Botsai, A.I.A. (Botsai, Overstreet Assoc.)  
Leonard E. Kingsley (Kingsley, Schreck, Wells & Co.)  
B. F. Biaggini (Pres., Southern Pacific Co.)  
Albert Shumate, M.D.  
Michael B. Wilmar (Marshall Kaplan, Gans and Kahn)

Concerned Citizens

The Rev. Robert Clifton  
Charles Starbuck  
Mrs. Alice Gowanlock  
Charles J. Krieger  
Tony Kilroy  
Mrs. Audrey Penn Rodgers  
Mrs. Patricia Mitchell  
Mrs. Lorraine C. Glasco  
Adele Bailey  
Ralph Dicker  
Leroy H. Hines  
Mrs. John G. Kamena  
F. H. Clayson  
Mrs. James Wiley  
Mrs. Jeanette Hufford

Government

Eunice Elton, Director, Manpower Planning and Research Unit  
Floyd H. Hyde, Asst. Secretary for Community Development, HUD  
Joseph Caverly, General Manager, Recreation and Park Department, SF  
Bernard A. Cummings, Chief, Property Conservation Division



July 21, 1971

## SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED

Since presenting the Urban Design Plan we have received many letters from citizens, businessmen, professionals and people in government. The response has been quite varied, and I might add overwhelmingly positive. Prior to final consideration of the Plan it is our intent to summarize the recommendations, criticisms and comment contained in these letters together with the comments made at these public hearings.

For now -- just to provide a picture of the letters received we have simply sorted them out by their general approach:

Endorsement by organization  
Favorable to part or all of Plan  
Critical of part or all of Plan  
Recommended additions to Plan  
Questioned meaning of parts of plan  
and Combinations thereof

Of the 12 neighborhood and civic organizations that sent letters:

7 were favorable  
2 endorsed Plan  
1 endorsed Plan and made recommendations  
1 questioned meaning of part of plan  
1 was critical of part of plan

Of the 15 business and professional people who wrote:

9 were favorable  
2 favorable with questions  
1 favorable with recommendations  
1 favorable with criticisms  
1 questioned parts of Plan  
1 critical

Of the 15 letters from concerned citizens:

11 were favorable  
2 favorable with questions on parts of Plan  
1 favorable with recommendations

We received 4 letters from people in government; as might be expected, all were favorable.



July 21, 1971

Totaling all letters received:

31 were favorable  
2 endorsements  
1 endorsement with recommendation  
3 favorable with criticisms  
2 favorable with recommendations  
2 favorable with questions  
2 critical  
1 questioning

Recommendations were for the most part for strengthening or clarifying elements of the Plan.

Criticisms were generally for not including or adequately covering something in the Plan deemed important. Only one took strong issue with a proposal of the Plan.

Questions focused on implementation and on the differences between the height and bulk plans.

John Bardis, 1353 Fourth Avenue, felt that the Urban Design Plan which had been prepared by the Department of City Planning was a landmark document; and he believed that the plan would serve as a vehicle for rational discussion of many things which affect the City. Yet, he was concerned about the map on page 93 of the report which would encourage construction of high-rise buildings on Mount Sutro and adjacent to Golden Gate Park. Using photographic slides to illustrate his point, he pointed out that extremely high density development has already taken place on the northern slopes of Mount Sutro; and, whereas the buildings of the University of California Medical Center used to allow sight of greenery higher on the hill as viewed from the north, buildings constructed more recently have entirely blotted out the view of the hill. As viewed from the west, the complex of buildings at the University of California Medical Center has a massive bulk. Thus far, the Medical Center has used only 2% of its campus for construction of major buildings; and plans are already being developed for construction of additional buildings on the northern portion of the campus. As a result, many houses on Arguello Boulevard south of Golden Gate Park have been put on the market for sale. Although the residential neighborhood in the vicinity of the University of California Medical Center has many open space resources, it is being overwhelmed by the construction by excessively massive buildings; and, if the present trend should be allowed to continue, he believed that the blight and decay which has affected the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood will move westward. He urged that the California Medical Center not be allowed to proceed with its plans for new construction on the block between Fourth and Fifth Avenues; and he proposed that no more major development should be undertaken by the Medical Center unless adequate service facilities are provided.



July 21, 1971

Byron Bray, 56 Alma Street, represented the Housing Committee of the Haight Ashbury Council. He felt that many aspects of the Urban Design plan would be beneficial to the future growth of San Francisco; however, he had reservations concerning two specific policies contained in the report, both of which were contained under the heading of "Policies for Major New Development." One of the policies stated that the height of buildings should be related to important attributes of the City pattern and to the height and character of existing development. The second policy specified that the bulk of buildings should be related to the prevailing scale of development to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction. While he had no disagreement with the policies themselves, he did not believe that they had been observed when specific recommendations had been made in certain neighborhoods. One of the maps which was contained in the report called for "medium-rise" buildings of five to twelve stories in height to be constructed along the Panhandle. He noted that properties adjacent to the Panhandle are presently occupied by old victorian houses which rise only two or three stories in height. Furthermore, surrounding properties are developed with buildings having a similar character. If the proposed policies relating to height and bulk had actually been applied to that area, he did not feel that the staff of the Department of City Planning would have designated the area as one appropriate for construction of five-to twelve-story buildings which would be incompatible with the existing pattern of development and which would destroy the relationship between the residential neighborhood and adjacent open space. While he was aware that a range of heights was involved in the staff's recommendation, he felt that even five-story buildings would be out of scale with buildings presently existing along the Panhandle; and he urged that a lower height limit be proposed for that area.

Mrs. J. Alan Daley, Sr., 795 Geary Boulevard, congratulated the staff of the Department of City Planning for the report which it had produced and endorsed the principles and policies which were being proposed. In addition, she repeated a request which had been made at last week's hearing by another individual to the effect that an affirmative statement should be included in the plan calling for the preservation of San Francisco Bay and supporting the objectives of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. She stated that she would urge the membership of all the organizations to which she belongs to support implementation of the Urban Design Plan and to demand that an investigation be made of the role which the Board of Permit Appeals plays in over-ruling the will of the Community.

John Kriken, 550 Battery Street, represented the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association. He read and submitted the following statement:

"The quality of life in our City - the combination of elements which create San Francisco's precious and unique character - is indeed in danger. Year by year San Francisco becomes a little more like every other major city. The Urban Design Plan comes just in time to prevent this.



"San Francisco's long-outdated Master Plan, first adopted in 1947, is undergoing a complete revision. The revision is being done in stages: The Improvement Plan for Residence was adopted earlier this year, the Urban Design Plan is currently up for adoption, and plans for transportation and recreation are being drawn for review in late 1971.

"The preparation of the Urban Design Plan, part of this comprehensive effort, began three years ago. Supported by a federal planning grant, the quarter-million-dollar effort was undertaken by a specially-recruited staff of urban design planners, assisted by a 28-member Urban Design Advisory Committee (more than half of whom are active SPUR members).

"During the preparation period, eight major reports on different elements of urban design were circulated for community review. The handsome document now being circulated summarizes all previous proposals, and after public hearings during July, is proposed to be adopted by the Planning Commission.

"This first-time-ever plan is the most important planning statement ever prepared for San Francisco. It lays down - in one, official document - most of the principles which must be followed if the City is to retain its visual magnificence. The plan recommends changes to existing policies (both conscious and unconscious) which are potentially destructive, and recommends new steps to improve the livability of those parts of San Francisco less conducive to joyful living. The City is famed for its striking vistas and colorful, dramatic panoramas: the legacy of a City of hills. Unfortunately, many of the charming views, so enjoyable from the heights, become tawdry and stultifying when experienced at close hand. The Urban Design Plan makes specific proposals for the city-scape at both levels: some recommendations deal with the development of landmarks and visual clues to increase an individual's understanding of where he is within the City. Other recommendations speak to improving livability at the block or neighborhood level.

"The objectives, principles and policies of the Plan are organized under four major headings: City Pattern, Conservation, Major New Development, and Neighborhood Environment.

"In its principles and policies, the Plan sets down a myriad of rules - against contour streets, in favor of informal planting on residential streets, establishing the appropriate bulk of buildings, etc. While there are necessary and appropriate exceptions to many of these rules, SPUR believes the composite structure of guidelines established in the Urban Design Plan to be of such overwhelming importance to constitute the policy document which stands the best chance of helping San Francisco to preserve its unique beauty.



July 21, 1971

"As observers of planning know all too well, no plan has a life of its own. Most die quickly, and are relegated to the shelf with little regret. In order for the Urban Design Plan to play the role it should in shaping San Francisco's future growth, it must become real. In order to become a "real" plan, it must become (1) known by the people, (2) known by the Supervisors, and (3) known by those who must be assigned responsibility for carrying it out.

"1. In order to become known by the people, the plan should be reproduced in a condensed popular rotogravure report to be widely distributed throughout the City. It should be the basis for a continuing campaign of contacts with dozens of community associations. Workshop sessions in neighborhoods should be sponsored to develop more specific plans for each district based upon the precepts of the Urban Design Plan.

"2. The Board of Supervisors is elected by San Franciscans to establish City policy which is used in determining budgetary priorities as well as forming the basis for day to day decisions. San Francisco, unfortunately, is one of very few California cities which does not require adoption of its master plan by the legislative body. Yet a plan which does not have the understanding and formal commitment of the legislative body does not fulfill its primary function: establishing public policy. The Planning Commission, then, should forward the Urban Design Plan (as well as other elements of the Comprehensive Plan) to the Board of Supervisors for public hearings and formal adoption.

"3. In order for the Plan to be known by those whose actions will be needed to carry it out, a specific action program should be devised. Such a program should assign responsibility for certain tasks to such agencies as the Department of Public Works, the Recreation and Park Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission. In order to assist in setting priorities for budget-making, a time schedule for expected completion of their responsibilities should be included.

"There are some who will question the cost of the Plan's proposals. They miss the point. This kind of plan is not meant to be carried out overnight. Its principles and policies are meant to govern private and public investment over the next several decades. Street improvements and private construction are being made all the time, and the channeling of these actions toward a unified order will be the Plan's greatest contribution.

SPUR applauds the Planning Department for the completion of a monumental and magnificent task. We pledge our assistance to see the Plan receives more widespread distribution, to see that it is adopted by the Board of Supervisors, to see that every City department recognizes its role in helping to carry out its objectives, and to stimulate a comprehensive effort to establish zoning based upon the Plan's proposals.



July 21, 1971

"While SPUR enthusiastically supports the adoption of this milestone plan, we would suggest several areas in which it might be strengthened by follow-through actions:

"1. More downtown detail. Much of San Francisco's image-creating development is located in or near the central district. Paradoxically, however, the Urban Design Plan devotes relatively little attention to this area, beyond establishing the quantitative bulk guidelines. There are many factors beyond height and bulk to be considered in determining the urban design character of the central district. The development of more specific guidelines for this area should be the subject of a more detailed plan. Such factors as these should be considered in developing new and more specific urban design guidelines:

- a) the preservation of view corridors through South of Market for all those North of Market Streets which now enjoy views of the Bay, the Bridge, or the Contra Costa hills;
- b) the loss of pedestrian amenity and the coarsening of downtown scale by the overuse of plazas at the base of high-rise buildings;
- c) special setback treatment along Market Street to provide a continuous, defined edge of moderate height and to protect the new BART plazas in a manner similar to Union Square;
- d) varying the height at which the Urban Design Plan bulk guidelines take effect based upon the width and character of the abutting streets;
- e) architectural details, such as color, finish, signing and exterior material.

"One principal purpose of the development of these more detailed downtown guidelines should be the thorough overhaul of the floor area ratio bonus system.

"2. An Implementation program. As mentioned earlier, the Urban Design Plan should be much more than a passive document, serving merely as a basis for the review of development proposals. An active public implementation program should be quickly developed. This action program should assign responsibility - on a scheduled, capital improvement program-type basis - to the agencies who must carry out the proposals of the Plan, and each agency should consider, modify, and adopt their section of the Urban Design Action Program. In order to encourage the different agencies' interest and cooperation in the action program, the Planning Department should develop the program in close consultation with the widest possible participation of citizens and neighborhood groups.



July 21, 1971

"3. Design review committees. Finally, SPUR recommends that the Planning Commission commence a special analysis of the possible use of design review commissions in San Francisco. Many of the smaller communities around the Bay Area have design review boards composed of design professionals which have the power to review and require modifications to all new buildings or major modifications except those relating to single-family residences. If Mill Valley, Mountain View and San Jose can use their design review boards to prevent McDonald's golden arches, why must San Francisco have an alpine-roofed Der Wienerschnitzel at the foot of Grant Avenue in Chinatown? SPUR would recommend the City seriously consider the establishment of a half dozen or more design review boards, one for each major district of the city. In addition reviewing the materials, color, landscaping, site layout, and design of structures, these design review boards should be given a key role in the control of signs and advertising in San Francisco. Both public and private signs are a strong determinant of the quality of the urban environment; their control should be given more serious attention."

Franz Steiner, 50 Anza Vista, informed the Commission that he is a professional architect. He felt that the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning was excellent; however, he noted that it is usually extremely difficult to codify aesthetic principles. Therefore, in order to implement the Urban Design Plan, he suggested that the City Planning Commission should be reconstituted with members who have design abilities and who are able to visualize from plans and sketches the impact which proposed projects might have on the City. While some people might argue that appointment of architects and landscape architects to the City Planning Commission might involve conflict of interest, he felt that the matter could be resolved by appointing design oriented people affiliated with the staff of a university.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Steiner would advocate a Charter Amendment which would allow non-residents to be appointed to the San Francisco City Planning Commission. Mr. Steiner replied that he would like to have the best people possible appointed to the City Planning Commission. Continuing with his comments, he remarked that a sketch on page 57 of the report which tried to show how buildings might be designed so that they would not be intrusive in older established residential neighborhoods was rather mundane in character; and he felt that it would not be good to refer to that sketch as a literal model in the future. The same would be true of many other sketches contained in the report. He suggested that the report should contain a policy for public buildings which would indicate that they should be beautiful and that they should be good buildings in which to work. He felt that the City should sponsor design competitions for new public buildings and that only the best architects should be hired to design the buildings; and he believed that the same procedure should apply to State and Federal buildings, also. In conclusion, he suggested that it might be desirable to provide a frame-work for volunteer programs to work towards achievement of the Urban Design Plan.



Edward Basset, One Maritime Plaza, identified himself as an architect, a general partner in the firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, and as a member of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee. He read and submitted a written statement which read, in part, as follows:

"In my estimation, the Plan represents a careful, thorough, and wide ranging context for future growth and corrective measures to our City. It has the added advantage of its specialness, of being a plan that could apply only here, to this city; not only because San Francisco's own qualities make it special, but because the plan was accomplished "in house", by people who know and understand their city well. This plan is the beginning of the process, not the end. The real work is yet to come. I hope very much that in the successive development of the plan, all of its parts will be examined carefully, insuring their workability as well as worth -- utilizing all the local expertise and citizen interest available.

"I hope also that you are aware of the additional responsibility of both yourselves and your department if this plan is to succeed, -- of staying loose, of not being boxed in by legal verbaese, of guarding against mediocrity, but being capable, too, of embracing the project from left field that succeeds by breaking all the rules."

Norman Rolfe, 1188 Green Street, represented San Francisco Tomorrow. He stated that he did not object to any of the proposals which were contained in the report; however, he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should have included additional recommendations in the plan for limiting the size and preserving the scale of the City. He remarked that San Francisco abounds in bad architecture; yet, when viewed as a whole, the City is extremely beautiful. In his opinion, the human scale of the City's buildings has created a harmony which overcomes the negative aspects of individual buildings which are poorly designed. He felt that the current economic pressures for construction of buildings which are out of scale with the rest of the City should be overcome locally, or, if necessary, at the State or Federal level. In addition, he believed that the redevelopment process should involve rehabilitation as well as new construction; and he remarked that the Redevelopment Agency should be required to work with a greater variety of developers. In conclusion, he urged that the Urban Design Plan be adopted and that the staff of the Department of City Planning continue to refine and implement the plan after its adoption.

William Gilmartin, 2224 Clay Street, represented the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council. He stated that 20 of the 110 members of his organization had had an opportunity to see the Urban Design Plan; and he indicated that most of them had reacted favorably to the proposals of the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that he had been employed as a planner for the Bell System before his retirement; and his personal opinion of the plan that it is excellent. The recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning



would give the City a broad-based plan for orderly growth which would be preferable to relying on chance; and, even though he realized that the plan would be subject to revision in the future, he felt that its adoption would reduce the amount of controversy to be faced by the Commission. His primary concern was with the problems which the Commission would face in implementing the plan; and, in that regard, he felt that Preliminary Report No. 7, which had dealt with implementation, would be of key importance. If the plan is not truly accepted and implemented, it will have been an exercise in futility; and he hoped that it would not meet that fate.

Stephen Wiecker, 899 Pine Street, represented the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce. He stated that his organization had studied the proposals of the staff of the Department of City Planning as well as proposals which had been made by other individuals and groups. While they were opposed to the establishment of a flat 6 story height limit for the City as a whole, they were also opposed to reckless and random development. While they felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should be complimented on the report which it had prepared, they felt that reports which had been prepared by other organizations on the same subject should be reviewed by the Commission before an Urban Design Master Plan is formally adopted. In the meantime, the Junior Chamber of Commerce believed that a moratorium should be put into effect on all new construction which would exceed 6 stories or 72 feet in height; and, since the Board of Supervisors had not taken action on a previous request by the Junior Chamber of Commerce to establish such a moratorium, the same request was now being made of the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Wiecker then proceeded to read the following statement which reflected his own personal views:

"It is my understanding that if an individual petitions for a zoning change there is an automatic "freeze" put on the area in question. I expect, however, it would be most difficult for a single individual to freeze the entire city. But this is not the case with the City Planning Commission. If you would issue a "Resolution of Intention" to adopt the Urban Design Plan Height Limits you can establish a freeze on the entire city until this issue is settled. The whole concept of the freeze was initiated so that the issue at hand would not become moot due to the construction of the questionable building or buildings before the issue was settled. Certainly we have before us today a situation which requires such a freeze as soon as possible -- for instead of one individual we have hundreds of major groups and tens of thousands of our citizens who are upset and concerned over recent developments.

"If you would pass a "Resolution of Intention" to adopt the height limits into law, the city by law will then have up to two years to consider sensible changes. In the meantime any developer who conforms to the newly proposed standards can be issued a permit with no difficulty. Certainly as this public debate continues, the high-rise map in question can be altered to whatever degree necessary to best serve the people of this city.



"As you are aware, the people who circulated the high-rise petition have now filed suit to prevent the City from issuing permits over six stories. It would seem to me that we are approaching a dangerous crossroad in the life of this City because in my opinion this whole thing is likely to polarize into a 'high-rise everywhere' vs 'high-rise nowhere' vote. I feel that regardless of who wins on the initiative vote in November, the pendulum of public thinking will be carried all too far to one side of the spectrum. Rather than have the city forced by the courts to adopt a freeze--or having the opposite side win and continue rampant development I feel that the City Planning Commission should voluntarily pass the 'Resolution of Intention' proposed here. Even if the courts force a temporary six story ban you have voluntarily committed yourselves to a viable, sensible, happy-medium.

"I would also like to point out at this time that some members of the business community have criticized any plan to freeze new buildings. I believe business should accept a freeze as favorable -- The cover story of Forbes' June 1st issue was entitled 'Who Owns New York Now?' The article portrays the disastrous consequences of owning property on Manhattan and explains that most real estate owners want out. The article finished by stating: 'The question isn't who owns New York. It's who the hell wants to?' This issue must be settled soon before San Francisco, too, builds itself into a trap it can never get out of.

"As evidence let me point out just one fact. If my figures are accurate, there were ten building permits issued for high-rise construction, that is -- over six stories -- during the entire year 1970. In 1971 it took only until May 11 to issue ten high-rise permits... And what's more, the total number of stories in the 1970 buildings was 147 -- while the first ten 1971 buildings total 215 stories.

"The time is at hand when the sensible people of this city must act -- pass a 'Resolution of Intention' on the Urban Design Plan Height Limits and give us a chance to save our City. Thank you."

Jerry Fillingim, 179 Downey Street, submitted and summarized the following prepared statement:

"Through out the Urban Design Plan policies are stated that I concur with wholeheartedly. I would like to compliment the City Planning Department Staff on a fine statement of policy. However, much to my dismay I find that the policies are not applied via the maps for the Haight-Ashbury.



"The only way I have of emphasizing this is to go thru the plan page by page and point out my agreement or disagreement.

"Page 10 under 'A Framework for the Issues' point 3 'Intrusion of new development which, through its visual dominance, height or excessive size, weakens or destroys important city or neighborhood qualities.' I support this idea as it applies to the Haight-Ashbury.

"Page 23 under 'Fundamental Principles for city Pattern' Principle 2-A I agree that low buildings on the slopes and in valleys accentuate the form of the hills. I disagree with the statement that tall slender buildings at the top of hills are important to accentuate form or that hills should be accentuated in this way. Although this plan was designed to consider the aesthetic character of San Francisco, there is much more to be considered before one recommends tall buildings. Quality in life must include a chance for privacy, for interesting activity, for a certain measure of security, health, comfort, enjoyment, and convenience, and freedom from over-congestion and pollution. Tall buildings drastically restrict all of these as well as produce tremendous social problems. To increase density with tall buildings is to increase personality problems, drug problem, pollution problems, juvenile problems, criminal problems, ad infinitem.

"Page 24-Principle 3 'Clearly visible open spaces act as orientation points, and convey information about the presence of recreation space to motorists and pedestrians. Comment: Because Buena Vista Park is visible from many parts of the city, it is often used as a point of reference. The foliage, in contrast to the surrounding developed areas, indicates the proximity of recreational means.' See map page 19

"Page 24-Principle 4 'Where large parks occur at tops of hills, lowrise buildings surrounding them will preserve views from the park and maintain visibility of the park from other areas of the city.'

"Page 36 under 'Policies for City Pattern' Policy 1, 'Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water.' I strongly support. Policy 4 'Protect and promote large-scale landscaping and open space that define districts and topography.' I support.

"Page 39-Policy 8, 'Increase the visibility of major destination areas and other points for orientation... Views from streets and other public areas should be preserved, created and improved where they include the water, open spaces, large buildings, and other major features of the city pattern.' I support.



"I support the statement made on page 47 that says, 'Historic buildings, and infact nearly all older buildings regardless of their historic affiliations, provide a richness of character, texture and human scale that is unlikely to be repeated often in new development. They help characterize many neighborhoods of the city, and establish landmarks and focal points that contribute to the city pattern.' There are many older historic buildings in the Haight-Ashbury that provide a richness of character to the neighborhood.

"If you will look at the map on page 48, you will observe that the Haight-Ashbury has a moderate concentration of landmark structures of historical and architectural merit. I would disagree, and say that we have a high concentration of such structures. I would also disagree with the map in leaving out an area of the Haight-Ashbury (Northwest corner of the H.A.--Fulton & Hayes) which also has structure of historic and architectual merit. True there used to be more of them, but they were torn down in the name of progress.

"Also let me call your attention to the map on page 49 entitled 'Quality of Visual Form and Character'. Most of the Haight-Ashbury is designated outstanding and unique. Again I would disagree. The entirety of the Haight-Ashbury has a visual and character quality that is outstanding and unique.

"On page 56 under 'Fundamental Principles for Conservation', Policy 3 I support. 'External details in building facades, entries, stairways, retaining walls and other features provide visual interest and enrichment and are consistent with the historic scale and texture of San Francisco. A. Richly detailed facades enhance the character of the street by giving it greater visual variety. Such detail often reduces building facades and textures to a more human scale and makes the street a more pleasant place to be.' By and large the homes in the Haight-Ashbury are homes of this type.

"Page 59, Policy 7 I strongly support. 'Renovation and restoration of older, well-designed buildings can preserve the character and interest of the streetscape if the original building design is respected in use of materials and details.'

"Page 69, 'Special Characteristics of Outstanding and Unique Areas' Buena Vista and Upper Market 'Exceptional variety produced by differences in street patterns across an uneven chain of hills, and a diverse mixture of building styles and roof types. A finely scaled building pattern of small wall surfaces and pastel colors, with highly visible planting on steep slopes.



Hilltop parks easily seen from below, with excellent views of the city from a central location.

Houses of varied sizes and individual forms having interesting setbacks, cornices and bay windows, many of notable architectural quality.' These and other statements concerning the character of the Haight-Ashbury are merely being pointed out to emphasize the wonderful nature of our neighborhood and emphasize the importance of preserving it.

"I disagree quite strongly with most of the maps located on pages 76 and 77. 'Tall Buildings could Improve Orientation for Travel.' The park with its tall trees gives adequate orientation for travel. The map entitled 'Effect of Tall Buildings upon view from Nearby Structure' does not make any sense. Of course there would be little affecting of views for nearby structures because the nearby structures and the tall buildings would become one and the same. Also people concerned about the view extends further than the people in the immediate block. In the map entitled 'Where Tall Buildings could help define Districts and Centers', the area along the Panhandle and Stanyan Street is indicated for medium rise--5 to 12 stories. I say that the Park is defined by its own nature and needs no medium-rise buildings to help define it and seal off the sunlight and views.

"In the map on page 77, much of the Haight-Ashbury is indicated as being potential for change and potential for tall buildings. How does one determine if an area has established 'appropriate' patterns of building height and scale? It would appear to me that the people of a neighborhood would build according to their needs and desires. If you will look at the map on page 78 which gives the existing scale, you will see that the Haight-Ashbury is within the 'small scale' with a prevailing height of 30 to 40 feet.

"On page 91 under 'Policies for Major New Development' I support Policy 1 to 'Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.'

"On page 92 I support Policy 4 that states in the explanation, 'New buildings should not block significant views of public open spaces, especially large parks...' However, the map on the opposite page shows tall buildings blocking significant views all along Golden Gate Park. The residents of the Haight-Ashbury will not be satisfied with the lower end of a 41 to 88 foot scale, we want a 40 foot height limit as per the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council Resolution. To build buildings higher than the existing buildings means tearing down or drastically changing buildings of a very unique character and architectural design. To build higher buildings would be to increase the residential density of the Haight-Ashbury which is already one of the densest areas of the city with a gross per acre density of from 60 to 119.9 persons. (See map page 52).



"According to this map there are other R-4 areas in the city and some in the Haight-Ashbury that are slated for a 40 foot height limit. I feel that the problems are more severe along the Panhandle. It should definitely have a 40 foot height limit because it is a smaller and more delicate park, and it has a much higher volume of traffic. To allow taller buildings is to allow more traffic congestion, less sunlight for the park, and blocked views.

"The Urban Design 8 gives some indication of the reasoning behind high density along the Panhandle. That is because it is a nice place to live with children. I lived on Fell Street and I can tell you it is not a nice place for children. A place with five lanes of fast moving traffic is not good for anyone. I can recall two times where if my daughter had taken one more step she would have been run over. Also gas fumes along Oak and Fell are so strong to be highly damaging to an active youngster playing outside and rapidly inhaling pollution.

"Many of the policies expressed in this Plan I support. The ones I have pointed out are simply those that I feel the strongest about and have some understanding of."

Calvin Welch, 417 Central Street, remarked that the population of San Francisco has actually declined over the past 20 years; yet, the plans which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning seemed to him to be in fact a "growth" plan which would require the Haight-Ashbury District and a limited number of other poor neighborhoods including Chinatown, South of Market and the ~~Western~~ Addition to bear the brunt of the growth being proposed. At the same time, other neighborhoods would be spared the ill effects of growth and would be allowed to observe their present characters. He did not feel that it was rational to conceive of growth in a city with an area of only 49 square miles; and, in any case, he felt that individual neighborhoods should be allowed to plan their own future instead of having such decisions made by the City Planning Commission.

Michael Doyle, 2531 Polk Street, represented the Environment Workshop. He stated that he had been a member of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee; and he felt that congratulations were in order to the staff of the Department of City Planning for the report which they had prepared. He was most impressed by the Street Livability Study and the recommendations for conservation of the City's architectural heritage; and he supported the philosophy expressed throughout the report to the effect that the City should be based on the needs of man. He hoped that zoning changes would be drafted to implement the Urban Design Plan; and, in the meantime, he urged the Commission to use the plan as a guideline for its review of specific development proposals. In conclusion, he indicated that he was in agreement with the recommendations which had been made by the representatives of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association for adoption of the Urban Design Master Plan element by the Board of Supervisors.



Arden Danekas, 131 14th Avenue, represented the Lake Street Traffic Committee. He stated that Lake Street had experienced serious traffic problems until a committee had been organized to cope with the problem; and he felt that there was hope for improvement of other residential streets in the City. Especially in need of improvements are California Street and Balboa Street, both of which are primarily residential in character but which carry heavy, and often fast, traffic. He asked about the official classification of the streets; and the Director replied that both California and Balboa Street are designated as arterials at the present time.

Mrs. Rena McCauley, 199 Edgewood Avenue, and a member of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, read the following prepared statement:

"In general, we feel that the Planning Department Staff should be complimented for the extensive and well thought out Urban Design Plan.

"However, we in the Haight-Ashbury District wish to address ourselves to that portion of the Design around the Panhandle and Golden Gate Park.

"We are particularly alarmed at the brown shadings on page 93 depicting future high rise because:

"1. Tall buildings along the Panhandle of the Park would diminish the recreational and aesthetic value of the park. (This is supported by Policy 4, Page 92, 'New buildings should not block significant views of public open spaces, especially large parks...') Further, streets that extend the effect of public open space (Page 50) are all streets in the Haight-Ashbury which lead into the park, that is, Haight Street and streets parallel to Haight. Indeed, these streets should have park related landscaping so as to enhance the visual open space effect to the Park.

"2. With reference to page 76, we believe the park is already defined by its own nature as well as by park related facilities such as bicycle shops. Such park related facilities should be added to, such as coffee shops, ice cream parlors, a park guide center, etc.

"3. Further high rise development would drastically change a very unique racial, social, and economic mix, a diversity the Haight-Ashbury has long fought to retain.

"While you may say this is just a proposal, we who live in and around these brown shadings as shown on Page 93, depicting future high rise are fearful that this depiction declares 'open sesame' for more speculators; more absentee landlords and we already have absentee landlords to spare. Absentee landlords have made their just contribution



July 21, 1971

to the area's downfall. This we are trying to discourage. We need your help and the help of every San Franciscan to fight for the preservation of one of the last residential areas, rich with the finest examples of Victorian architecture.

"We cannot continue to claim to the phrase San Francisco is the 'City that knows how.' There are over nineteen cities in the U.S.A. who do know how and are showing us how by restoring and rehabilitating their traditional and irreplaceable architecture. It is not enough to say 'we know how.' If we know how we must do."

Sally J. Walker, 11 Clara Street, represented the Environment Workshop and residents of the South of Market area. She complimented the staff of the Department of City Planning on the Urban Design Plan and indicated that she agreed with many of the comments which had been made by previous speakers. She felt that the recommendations contained in the plan should be endorsed by the City Planning Commission; and once adopted, she hoped that the policies expressed in the plan would not be overlooked in the future for political reasons as has been the case in the past.

Gerald Cauthen, 1975 Clay Street, viewed the Urban Design Plan as being composed of three parts including a) a description of what is good and what is bad which in essence becomes guidelines for future development, b) policies for public projects, and c) proposed zoning code changes. He was happy to see that so many heretofore unheralded parts of San Francisco had been recognized as unique and valuable; and he was pleased that most of the important elements which in the past had detracted from the harmony of the beauty of the City had been identified. He also felt that it would be entirely proper and desirable to preserve old structures of quality and to insist that new structures harmonize with the older buildings. Those were just a few of the descriptive elements which he believed to be significant in the report. With regard to the proposed policies for public projects, he indicated his agreement with most of the lighting, landscaping, traffic control, and other measures proposed. And he indicated that his only criticism concerned the fact that an insufficient amount of attention has been paid to the excessive number of vehicles now using the streets in San Francisco. He felt that residential neighborhood should be protected from automobiles as recommended in the report; and, in addition, he believed that streets designated as "arteries" should also be protected by reducing the number of automobiles, particularly commuter vehicles, currently using streets in the City.

With regard to the third aspect of the report which involved proposals for zoning code changes, Mr. Cauthen made the following comments:

"Some General Recommendations on the Proposed Zoning Code"

"In the portion of the Plan devoted to proposed zoning changes, there is contained some highly significant proposals which would affect



the heights and densities of developments in nearly every part of the city. The major criticism of the Plan and the accompanying public presentations is that they fail to describe the impact of these changes in terms that are understandable to the public. In other words we need slides indicating the appearance of a future high building in Balboa Park, as seen from the Monterey Heights area, just as much as we need a slide showing an existing open garage in the Richmond District.

"One specific suggestion for change concerns the area to the south-east, south and southwest of Lafayette Square. The proposed height limit of 161 to 240 feet would unduly interfere with the use and enjoyment of the park.

"On Page 66, Policy 3 deals with the waterfront development question. 'Strong public purpose and increased public access' could be misconstrued to justify some extremely inappropriate developments. The Ferry Port Plaza project was judged by many architects and thousands of San Franciscans to be inappropriate because it was just too big, regardless of the fact that public access to the water, in the strictly literal sense of the word 'access' was increased.

"Finally I would like to suggest that a re-evaluation of the downtown density bonus features be included as part of any in the past 4 years we have seen a number of examples of how some of these bonus features have fallen short of their expected benefits in terms of a public amenity supplied. Builders should not be encouraged to increase the densities of their structures unless a very real and demonstrable public benefit is involved.

"In conclusion I would like to reiterate that with the exception of the items alluded to I find the Plan to be a great step forward for San Francisco."

Ray Waller, 1525 Waller Street, and President of the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, remarked that the plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning seemed to be quite commendable except with regard to the recommendations which had been made for the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood. He advised the Commission that residents of the Haight-Ashbury district are not in favor of having tall buildings in their neighborhood; and he read and submitted a resolution which had been adopted by the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council on May 13, 1971, as follows:

"WHEREAS, the Haight-Ashbury residents value the integrated composition of their neighborhood; the character of their fine old buildings; the existence of the finest examples of Victorian architecture, the beauty of its views, and,



July 21, 1971

"WHEREAS, it is evident that the quality and variety of most of its sound buildings are in need of physical upgrading and rehabilitation and that residential clearance and eventual displacement of people is unnecessary to upgrade the neighborhood;

"NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council goes on record and requests the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission and the City Planning Department to support the forty (40) foot above ground height limit with a thirty (30) percentage frontage curb cut restriction for all future construction, without variance, within the Haight-Ashbury confines as outlined in the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood's By-Laws, to-wit:

'Arguello Street on the west; Fulton Street on the north; Divisadero and Castro Streets on the east; and on the south 17th Street west to Clayton, south on Clayton to Carmel, west on Carmel to the point beyond Shrader at which Carmel and Arguello would intersect if both were extended.'

"FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors enact their own resolution for the legal implementation of all intents within the contents of this resolution, so as to improve the Haight-Ashbury in keeping with the objectives stated above."

Commissioner Porter, noting that some of the areas in the Haight-Ashbury District where the staff of the Department of City Planning had proposed construction of higher buildings are presently zoned R-4, a district in which high-rise buildings are allowed; and she wondered if a change of zoning might be desired rather than a specific height limit. Mr. Waller replied that the members of his organization would want both a change of zone and a specific height limit for certain areas in their neighborhood.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that imposition of a flat height limit without a change of the R-4 zoning of the properties might result in the construction of lower buildings which would completely cover their lots; and he doubted that such development would be acceptable to the neighborhood.

Mr. Waller stated that residents of the neighborhood wished to perpetuate the present character of development in the area. He indicated that they were afraid of high buildings and of overcrowding; and, in his own opinion, R-4 properties in the area should be rezoned to R-3.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Waller if he felt that his organization could obtain the support of the owners of the properties in question if reclassification or specific height limits were to be proposed. She remarked that it might be easier to get their support for a 40 foot height limit than for a change of zone which would affect the economic value of their properties.



Mr. Waller stated that he was confident that the Haight Ashbury Council could come before the Commission with comparative agreement from the property owners involved with regard to its proposals.

Marian Robertson, 1788 Edgewood Avenue and a member of the Edgewood Neighborhood Association, endorsed the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council's request for a 40 foot height limit within the Haight-Ashbury District.

Walter Knox, 320 Clementina Street, represented the Senior Legislative Council and the Central City Citizens Council, Inc. He felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should be complimented on the report which it had prepared; and he indicated that he would be willing to endorse the policies contained in the report as long as they would prevent buildings from rising above the highest hills in the City, since construction of buildings exceeding the height of the hills might bring about a drastic change in the climate of the area.

Tony Kilroy, 473 11th Avenue, endorsed the resolution which had been adopted by the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council calling for a 40 foot height limit in their neighborhood. He also suggested that the following paragraph should be included on page 2 of the Urban Design Plan: "It is a guide for choosing, in a given situation, among the available alternatives, as rationally as possible, with the probable consequences for the City known at the time of the decision, and with all the public values taken into account." He felt that inclusion of that statement would help to insure that the Urban Design Plan is used as a guide and not as the last word.

Mr. Kilroy then continued reading the following prepared statement:

"The plan on page 3 says that man must have the humility to live with the environment rather than attempt to master it and in several places mentions ecology (page 10,45) but it does not recognize or even mention city wildlife. Improvement of city wildlife both in the open space areas and throughout residential and other parts of the city would certainly be an asset to the environment.

"This aspect of the environment has been given short shift by city officials and it is time it was incorporated in all proposed plans for San Francisco. Pages 6, 46, and 66 discuss building on City Parks and give the impression that recreation buildings on open space is acceptable. I disagree. Too much open space and park area has been used by facilities which could just have easily been located elsewhere. For example, gymnasiums, swimming pools and even city libraries. This policy should be reviewed and buildings on open space discouraged. Page 7 discusses confrontations that come too late to affect proposals and modifications can be made only after delay and additional cost.



July 21, 1971

"Page 96 recommends early communication between the developer and others including interested citizens. However, the processes for development review and decision making diagrams on pages 138 and 139 only require 'possible consultation' at the start of the process except amazingly enough for the 'Redevelopment Process' when hearings are held at the beginning.

"' Possible consultation' should be made mandatory with public notice and a hearing if deemed necessary for all the processes shown on pages 138-139.

"The policy on page 32 'Wide streets with low and/or scattered buildings are poorly defined and do not contribute to an orderly city pattern and image' may be true in some cases. However, the Phillips Service Station at Presidio and Geary provides an excellent vista for people at that intersection for views of parts of the Western Addition and Pacific Heights. A high-rise or other building at this location would block this view.

"Page 36 and other pages continually emphasize the need to identify open spaces with high-rise buildings. This is very debatable and I believe unnecessary. Most open spaces have large trees rising to considerable heights and I for one would prefer to identify open spaces by trees rather than high-rise buildings.

"Page 38, Policy 6 states that centers of activity may be expected to have buildings larger than those of the surrounding area. This is not necessarily true. Union Street between Van Ness and Steiner is a good example that contradicts this policy.

"Page 40 includes recommendations for lighting. More use should be made of 'warm' lighting than blue-white or white.

"Page 67, Policy 6 should apply to all new buildings. New buildings in residential neighborhoods that protrude to the street line should receive special consideration when they spoil an existing line of existing structures.

"Pages 76, 93, 95 contains maps of potential high-rise areas. I disagree with the proposal that it is necessary to consider such large developments on both sides of the Park and throughout the Richmond District.

"Page 147 a better definition is needed of the downtown zoning bonus. It is time these so-called amenities were reviewed again as I believe they were established in 1967.



"Page 151 discusses street improvements and sidewalk clutter and design. This should include the proliferation of phone booths that has recently hit the city which are the most utilitarian structures I have seen."

The Director, commenting upon the remarks which had been made by Mr. Bardis, stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had already begun to give consideration to some of the concerns which he had expressed about the Inner Sunset. The Director agreed that some of the development which has taken place on the University of California Medical Center Campus has not always been of the highest quality. He felt that there was a good chance of changing the situation in the future; however, he felt that everyone should recognize that the City legally has no control over State-owned property. Nevertheless, the Commission could still adopt a plan which would establish guidelines for development of the Medical Center Property and urge the State to respect those guidelines.

Mr. Bray and other speakers had objected to the map which indicated that buildings of five to twelve stories would be acceptable along the Panhandle. The staff of the Department of City Planning was aware of a contradiction between the bulk and height maps included in the report; and he indicated that the contradiction will be corrected in the final plan. In any case, if a height of 40 feet were to be indicated, it would be the controlling factor even though the bulk map might suggest that a building from 5 to 12 stories would be acceptable. Furthermore, while a range of from 5 to 12 stories had been indicated in the report for properties along the Panhandle, the staff had actually been thinking of buildings with heights ranging from 41 to 88 feet which would actually be at the lower or middle part of the range which had been indicated. He emphasized that height along the Panhandle is presently unlimited; and, while the staff's recommendation for limitation of heights to the range between 40 and 88 feet might not be acceptable to the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, establishment of such height limits would be a drastic reduction from the unlimited height now permitted.

The Director agreed with Mr. Kriken that it would be desirable for the Department of City Planning to undertake major publication and continuing education programs; however, such programs would not be feasible given the present limited budget of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Kriken had also suggested that the Board of Supervisors, as well as the City Planning Commission, should formally adopt elements of the Master Plan; but, while he understood the reasons for that suggestion, he remarked that formalization of that approach might place the Commission in the position of having to forget about or ignore sections of the Master Plan which the Board of Supervisors might choose not to adopt. He did not feel that such a situation would be desirable.

Mr. Steiner has urged that more positive policies be included in the Urban Design Plan to control the design of public buildings. The Director pointed out to him, however, that several policies had been included in the plan which would achieve that objective, including policy number three on page 91 which called for promoting efforts to achieve high quality of design for building to be constructed



July 21, 1971

at prominent locations, policy number five on page 128 which called for provision of adequate maintenance for public areas, and policy number eight on page 129 which called for provision of convenient access to a variety of recreational opportunities. In addition, proposals for all public buildings will continue to be reviewed by the City Planning Commission as a part of the Capital Improvement Program process. Mr. Steiner had also urged that the City Planning Commission be reconstituted with design-oriented members; but the Director, pointing out that the Commission deals with many issues other than design, stated that he would not favor exclusive design-oriented membership for the Commission.

Mr. Rolfe had called for re-orientation of the redevelopment process; and the Director informed him that the staff of the Department of City Planning, as a result of a similar concern, had already recommended that the City Planning Commission adopt a set of guidelines for future redevelopment projects. Mr. Rolfe had also expressed a desire for mixed uses throughout the City; and, while the Urban Design Plan did not deal with that subject, other elements of the Master Plan would take the matter into consideration. Mr. Rolfe had also expressed a dislike for large development projects, stating that the City should be kept at a human scale. The Director believed that the bulk guidelines which had been recommended in the Urban Design Plan would meet that problem.

The Director advised Mr. Weicker that the staff of the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission would give consideration to establishment of a moratorium on new developments which would exceed the guidelines contained in the Urban Design Plan until such time as precise legislation can be prepared to encompass those guidelines.

Mr. Welch had described the Urban Design Plan as a "growth plan"; however, the Director, remarking that there is a substantial difference between growth and change, informed him that the Urban Design Plan was concerned more with change than with growth. Mr. Welch had also assumed that the policies contained in the plan would result in transformation of the Haight-Ashbury district. The Director disagreed, noting that the only significant effect which the Urban Design Plan would have on the Haight-Ashbury district would be to reduce substantially the height limits allowed along the Panhandle. Mr. Rolfe has also interpreted the plan to indicate that only poor neighborhoods would be asked to absorb growth in the future; the Director disagreed, noting that height and growth do not necessarily have a correlative relationship. To emphasize his point, he referred to a map on page 148 of the report which showed the relationship of building height guidelines to existing height controls and pointed out that the areas where greater height had been recommended are scattered around the City and are not all located in poor areas.

Mr. Danekas had seemed to feel that streets which are developed with housing should not be designated as traffic arterials; however, the Director noted that most of the major streets in San Francisco do have residential development.



July 21, 1971

Mrs. McCauley had objected to high-rise construction on the edges of Golden Gate Park; however, the proposal of the staff was for construction of buildings from 41 to 88 feet in that area. Furthermore, the staff had indicated that the height of new construction should be kept to the middle or lower end of that range. While Mr. Cauthen had felt that height and bulk considerations constituted the heart of the report, the Director disagreed, remarking that the recommendations for neighborhood improvements seemed to him to be of equal or even greater importance. Mr. Cauthen had also called for re-consideration of the floor area ratio bonuses offered in the Downtown district; and the Director indicated that the staff would be willing to review any specific problem areas which might be called to its attention. In any case, the recommendations of the Urban Design Plan would drastically reduce the allowable building height in the South of Market area. The Director felt that Mr. Cauthen's remarks concerning traffic and transit were constructive; and he stated that those issues would be reflected in the Transportation Plan which is now being prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Finally, Mr. Cauthen had suggested that sketches should have been prepared to illustrate the consequences of some of the policies which had been proposed in the Urban Design Plan; but the Director indicated that architectural renderings had purposely been avoided in the policies section of the report so that the document proposed for adoption would not appear to be an architectural plan rather than an Urban Design Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker expressed his appreciation to the members of the audience for attending the third public hearing on the Urban Design Plan. He also indicated that an additional period of two weeks, or until August 4, would be allowed for submission of written comments to the Department of City Planning. He then asked for a motion to take the matter under advisement until the Commission's regular meeting on August 26, 1971, at 3:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall. The motion was made by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously. The Commission also voted to set the date of August 4 as the deadline for receipt of written statements on the Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



DIRECTOR'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SUMMARY AND MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
THURSDAY  
JULY 22, 1971  
100 LARKIN STREET  
1:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Porter, Ritchie

1:00 P.M.

1. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a Field Trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on August 5.

Adjourned: 2:30 p.m.



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held August 5, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 5, 1971, at 1:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; George Carey, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Samuel Jung, Planner IV; William Proctor, Planner IV; Daniel Sullivan, Planner III (Zoning); Patricia Peterson, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of July 1, 14, and 15, 1971, be approved as submitted.

## CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting next Monday, is scheduled to hear an appeal from a City Planning Commission decision denying an application for a conditional use for automobile dismantling yards in the South Bayshore Area.

Mr. Murphy then recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which would approve a supplemental budget appropriation in the amount of \$2,625.00 for the Department of City Planning to effect the July 1, 1971, increase from 11.205% to 11.502% of the City's contribution to the Retirement System. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Carey, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as Planning Commission Resolution No. 6736.

R71.27 - Temporary helistop, San Francisco General Hospital.  
(Postponed from Meeting of July 15, 1971).

Joseph Mignola, Assistant Director of Public Health, Hospital Services, asked that the subject referral be withdrawn. He stated that construction has



August 5, 1971

begun on the new main hospital building; and, as a result, a parking problem had arisen which must be resolved before the project for the temporary helistop can proceed.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Carey and carried unanimously that authorization be given for withdrawal of the subject referral.

R70.81 - Sale of Lot 1, Block 206, southwest corner of Washington and Battery Streets.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the City Planning Commission considered a referral from the Director of Property on February 11, 1971, regarding the sale of City properties at nine different locations. The Commission's recommendation with regard to the sale of Lot 1, Block 206, a 25 x 97-foot lot at the southwest corner of Washington and Battery Streets, was that it

should be deferred pending study of the feasibility of extending the elevated pedestrian system westerly from the Golden Gateway along Washington Street. The study should be made within one year.

"A project for extending the elevated walkway system westward so that pedestrians would be separated from vehicular traffic all the way to Portsmouth Square is feasible, but it would be extremely difficult to accomplish. In the three blocks separating Maritime Plaza from Portsmouth Square, several private properties as well as a proposed fire station would have to be developed or modified to accommodate the walkway, although provision has already been made for addition of such a walkway on the Holiday Inn and Transamerica properties. Furthermore, the bridging of Battery, Sansome and Montgomery Streets would be costly and could produce undesirable visual effects. The lack of an enforceable plan and the consequent need to rely on persuasion, the multiple ownerships, and the uncertainties of financing are formidable obstacles in the way of bringing such an elevated pedestrian system to reality.

"It would be possible for the City to place a deed restriction on the sale of Lot 1, or reserve an easement through the lot to make it easier to bridge Battery Street in the future, either of which would reduce the amount for which the City could sell the property, but it would be necessary to convince the Board of Supervisors of the merit and feasibility of the proposal for a three-block extension of the elevated walkway system."



August 5, 1971

Mr. Murphy remarked that it would seem that the practical feasibility of the project was not very great in view of the enumerated obstacles; and, therefore, he recommended that the sale of the property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the sale of Lot 1, Block 206, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R71.38 - Proposal to abandon the Fourth Street Overcrossing Project and to move the present site of the Southern Pacific passenger station to Fourth and Townsend Streets.

William Proctor, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The Proposal:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, a letter has been received from the Director of Public Works, dated May 4, 1971, recommending that a proposal of the Southern Pacific Company be approved. It is claimed that this proposal, described below, would make the Fourth Street Overcrossing Project unnecessary.

"This substitute proposal includes:

- (1) Moving the site of the SP's Third and Townsend Depot one block west to Fourth and Townsend;
- (2) Removal of the 14 terminal tracks now crossing Fourth, so that Fourth can be rebuilt as a major thoroughfare;
- (3) Elimination of the proposed Fourth Street Overcrossing Project;
- (4) Connecting Fourth Street to the Southern-Embarcadero Freeway with an on-ramp at Fourth and King to replace the ramp which would have led to the freeway from the overcrossing structure;
- (5) Consolidating the terminal train yards in the area west of Fourth Street, reconstructing the terminal track facilities, and abandonment of the block east of Fourth Street for terminal purposes. This is made possible by transfer of all long-distance train operations, under AMTRACK, to Oakland.

"The Fourth Street Overcrossing project is in the current Capital Improvement Program, (Project No. 670.68.205). Estimated costs are \$2.2 million, of which the railroad's share, under State Public Utilities Commission formula, is reported to be \$1.7 million.



"In correspondence with the Chief Administrative Officer, and with the City Engineer, the railroad has stated that it would complete the new station within two years' time, prior to the opening of the Sixth-to-Third sector of the freeway, that it would provide a new depot with enclosed waiting rooms, off-street loading space for buses and taxis, that it would remove the existing fourteen terminal tracks from Fourth Street between Townsend and King Streets and reconstruct the street to City standards, and that it would negotiate with the City on reimbursement to the City and to the State on expenses already incurred on the overcrossing project (engineering and property acquisition), and on the cost of relocating wires for trolley buses to reach the new site.

"Recommendation of the Director of Public Works

"In his May 4 letter, the Director of Public Works recommended favorable consideration of this proposal by the City Planning Commission:

- (1) Traffic would be served as well as by the overcrossing;
- (2) 'A large structure with its visual impact would be eliminated';
- (3) The City, the State, and the railroad would all save money.

"Public Works Department staff members have also indicated that this would solve the problem of trains at the depot blocking Fourth Street, that Fourth Street would be restored for use as a major thoroughfare, and that it could be connected with the freeway by a redesigned ramp, that a major portion of the City's share of the cost of the overcrossing could be saved. They also have pointed out that some increased distance is involved for the typical Financial District worker in his trip to the SP Depot, but that this additional distance--about 825 feet--is not significant in view of the typical travel distances of from a mile to a mile-and-a-half.

"Conclusions from Analysis by Staff of the Department of City Planning

"A. Scope:

"Whereas the Department of Public Works has concerned itself primarily with the effects of the SP proposal on vehicular traffic patterns, analysis by staff members of the Department of City Planning also included:

- (1) The probable effect of the impact of the proposed change on Peninsula commute patterns: In other words, would this moving of the station away from the destination of most of the commuters be a "downgrading" of the rail commute service, or



would it be interpreted by rail commuters as a downgrading, even if the effects were really not significant? Would this cause rail commuters to shift to daily use of their autos, thus clogging our downtown streets and garages more than at present?

(2) The probable impact of the proposed land use changes in the block east of Fourth Street to be abandoned to terminal purposes.

"B. Findings:

- (1) About 9,700 SP commuters now go through the SP Third and Townsend Depot twice daily on their way to and from San Francisco points.
- (2) Three-fifths of these use the Municipal Railway buses, and two-thirds of the SP-Muni patrons go to and from Financial District points (about 4,200 persons).
- (3) Muni schedules call for 8 to 9 minutes travel time between the depot and Financial District points at frequencies of from one to two minutes.
- (4) If the depot were relocated, best estimates are that bus travel time to and from the Financial District might be increased by from one to four minutes per round trip, depending upon new routing, waiting time at traffic signals and traffic volumes attracted by the new freeway ramps.
- (5) Travel time of the remaining one-third SP-Muni patrons probably would not be increased by the changed location, and in fact a small number of SP commuters from the Civic Center area would probably save several minutes each way every day.
- (6) One-quarter of the SP patrons now walk to and from the depot. About half of these walk to or from points in the Financial District, their trips taking from fifteen minutes to half an hour or more depending on location. Their walks would be increased by about four minutes' walking time.
- (7) Walkers to other points, such as the Union Square area, would not be adversely affected by the changed site, and Civic Center and Mission District walkers would save about four minutes each way.
- (8) The question of building the overcrossing if, in ten or fifteen years' time, it might not be needed, is an important



consideration. Serious efforts are now under way to develop a means of extending BART to San Francisco International Airport, with a good possibility that it could later be extended south on the Peninsula as far as San Jose. With the southward extension of BART, there would be a good chance that the existing SP commute service might be modified or discontinued, in which case an overcrossing over the terminal yards might not be needed.

"C. Conclusions:

- (1) Preliminary analysis indicates that the proposal to move the station and reconstruct Fourth Street, instead of building the overcrossing (and leaving the station in its present location) would serve vehicular traffic patterns substantially as well as the overpass project with the station in its present location.
- (2) The few minutes' increased bus travel time and walking time to the new station location from the Financial District should not result in significant reductions of SP Peninsula commute patronage, providing:
  - (a) That the new station is convenient, attractive, has sufficient loading and unloading space, protection of bus and train passengers from adverse weather conditions, and conveniences and amenities for the rail passenger equal to (or even a little better than) those now provided in the existing depot facility.
  - (b) That bus routing and traffic control arrangements result in the minimum possible addition in travel time for trips to and from downtown.
- (3) If improvements to Peninsula train scheduling were instituted by the SP, to add a few more fast peak-hour expresses, and to add trains in the off-peak periods to fill the present long periods (up to two and a half hours) when no trains are available, it is quite possible that considerable increased rail patronage might be stimulated, despite the move of the station one block away from Financial District destinations.

"Recommendations:

"Since the railroad's proposal to move the station to Fourth Street, reconstruct Fourth Street, and abandon the Fourth Street Overcrossing appears to serve vehicular traffic patterns as well as the overcrossing project, and since there is good reason to believe that this can be accomplished with no real detriment to the Peninsula rail



commuter, no constructive purpose would be served by opposing this change because of the chance that the new arrangements would not work.

"Rather, approval should be given, but with provisos to insure that the changes will result in no detriment to the Peninsula rail commuter, to South-of-Market traffic patterns, or to South-of-Market development trends. The change in depot site and elimination of the overcrossing will provide real benefits to the Southern Pacific. Thus, it seems appropriate that there should be some benefit to the City: Short-term as to traffic benefits, long-term as to stimulation of greater use of rail transit in the daily trips into and out of downtown San Francisco, and as to the effect on the development pattern of the South-of-Market area.

"It is recommended that the Director of Planning be directed to report that the proposal of the Southern Pacific Company, recommended by the Director of Public Works in his letter dated May 4, 1971, is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that:

- (1) Successful negotiations are worked out with appropriate city officials as to equitable payment by the railway of applicable costs.
- (2) The City Planning Commission shall review and approve detailed plans for the new Fourth and Townsend Station structure, to insure:
  - (a) An attractive and inviting design;
  - (b) Adequate facilities for loading and unloading of passengers for buses, taxis, and private autos, including a large loading plaza on Fourth Street, as well as off-street loading spaces on Townsend Street, and, if needed, on King Street, and provisions for protection from the weather of persons boarding trains and buses during winter storms.

"In addition, it is recommended that the railroad give consideration to improvement of Peninsula train schedules to compensate for time-losses to bus riders and walkers because of the new depot location, including greater frequency of trains in off-peak periods, and addition of more fast peak-hour expresses during peak periods.

"The pattern for improvement of the vacated property in the Third-Townsend-Fourth-King Streets block need not be settled at this time, since this would come before the City Planning Commission under provisions of the City Planning Code when plans are developed for new uses and/or construction on the block to be abandoned for terminal use."



Commissioner Porter remarked that approval of the proposal to construct a new passenger terminal would be tantamount to recommending that the landmark building at Third and Townsend Streets be razed..

Commissioner Ritchie indicated that he shared Commissioner Porter's concern about the existing depot. In addition, he remarked that an extremely large parcel of property is involved in the proposal; and he felt that the Commission should be provided with more and clearer information regarding the Southern Pacific's development plans and the relationship between any development being proposed and existing structures in the area including freeway ramps, etc.

Mr. Proctor displayed a working map of the area and described the general character of the existing and proposed developments in the vicinity of the subject property. Mr. Ritchie felt that the Commission should be shown a larger scale map of the area so that it would be better able to visualize all of the ramifications of the subject proposal.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he was in favor of avoiding construction of an overpass at Fourth Street; and he remarked that the overpass would have to be constructed if the Southern Pacific Depot were not to be relocated. Therefore, he moved that the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning be approved. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rueda.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he agreed with all of the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning except for the requirement that provision be made for protection from the weather of persons boarding trains and buses during winter storms. He remarked that only the train stations in San Francisco and San Jose provide such protection at the present time; and, since canopies would cost approximately \$400,000 and would be of limited usefulness, he did not feel that the Commission should make their approval of the project contingent upon such a requirement.

Robert C. Levy, City Engineer, confirmed that his staff had determined that traffic on Fourth Street would be served as well or even better by the proposal presently under consideration than by construction of an overcrossing; and he believed that any delays in Municipal Railway service which might be caused by relocating the train depot would have only a very minimal effect.

Allan Firth, Vice President and General Counsel for the Southern Pacific Railroad, felt that the interests of both the City and County of San Francisco and the Southern Pacific Railroad would be served if construction of a massive overcrossing at Fourth Street could be avoided. He stated that no definite discussion had been made regarding the design of the new passenger station; however, the type of facility which was being contemplated was depicted on a sketch which he displayed on the wall of the meeting room. He noted that a waiting room would be provided for the protection of passengers during inclement weather; and, since trains would no longer have to traverse the slow block between Fourth and Third Streets, the passengers would be able to proceed to their final destinations more



quickly, thus making up for the fact that the new station would be located one block further from the financial district. He urged that the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted.

Commissioner Porter asked if the applicant had any objection to any of the recommendations which had been made by the staff. Mr. Firth replied that he would object to a condition requiring construction of sheds to protect passengers boarding trains from the weather since such sheds would double the cost of the new facility and would be of limited usefulness.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that all of the BART stations will provide some protection from the weather for the passengers boarding or leaving its trains.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that the lack of such sheds would not affect commuter patronage; however, a fare increase to pay for the canopies would be likely to decrease patronage.

Mr. Proctor stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning did not contemplate a need for canopies as long or as strong as the concrete sheds in place at the existing station. He felt that a temporary or permanent covering at least two car lengths long would be desirable.

Commissioner Mellon felt that such a requirement would be reasonable.

Mr. Firth stated that he appreciated the concern which had been expressed by Mr. Proctor; and he indicated that his staff would be willing to discuss the matter further with the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that the plan for the new station which had been displayed by Mr. Firth differed from the one which had been incorporated into the working map which had been described by Mr. Proctor; and he felt that the discrepancy highlighted the fact that the Commission should have an opportunity to review all of the most up-to-date proposals concerning the subject neighborhood on a comprehensive map before taking action on the referral.

Commissioner Mellon felt that the Commission had received all of the information which it needed to take action on the specific matters under consideration.

Commissioner Rueda stated that the discussion had convinced him that the Commission should have an opportunity to review better maps before taking action on the referral; and he felt that it would be desirable for individual Commissioners to take field trips to the property in question. Therefore, he withdrew his second of Commissioner Fleishhacker's motion. The motion was then seconded by Commissioner Mellon.

Commissioner Porter then offered a substitute motion to take the matter under advisement for two weeks. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ritchie who also requested that a large scale map of the area showing the proposed project be available for review by the Commission at that time.



Commissioner Mellon stated that negotiations between the Southern Pacific Railroad and the City could not possibly be concluded within two weeks; and he indicated that he was anxious that the Commission should avoid taking any action which would weaken his position at the negotiating table.

Mr. Levy remarked that the proposal is scheduled to be heard by the State Public Utilities Commission on August 12; and, while that hearing could be postponed, any undue delay might compromise the City's position.

After further discussion, Commissioner Porter revised her motion to call for the matter to be brought before the Commission again in one week. The revised motion was seconded by Commissioner Mellon. When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to take the matter under advisement until the meeting of August 12, 1971.

At 2:20 p.m., President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 2:30 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

2:30 P.M. Room 282, City Hall

CU71.30 - 1400 Mission Street, northwest corner of Tenth Street.

Request for an automatic automobile wash in a C-3-G District.  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of July 1, 1971)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that new plans had been submitted by the applicant which called for one automobile entrance and two automobile exits on Mission Street. However, since the new plans were not substantially different from those which had previously been submitted, the staff of the Department of City Planning continued to be of the opinion that the application should be approved only if the facility were to be designed in accordance with the site plan concept which had been developed by the staff of the Department of City Planning. It was also indicated that the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) had again reviewed the proposal and had determined that driveways on Mission Street would be acceptable only if they were to be used exclusively for access to the gasoline pumps.

Michael Ohleyer, attorney for the applicant, stated that revised plans had been prepared which separated the entrance and exits on Mission Street to relieve congestion and which moved them further from the corner in order to provide more loading space for the Municipal Railway. The revised plans had been discussed with the staff of the Department of City Planning on July 16; and he had understood at the conclusion of that meeting that the revised plans were considered acceptable by the Department. He had then written to the individual members of the Commission, enclosing the revised plans and indicating that the plans had been agreed to by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He had not been advised of the staff's objections to the plans until a few hours before the present meeting.



Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the economic feasibility of the proposed project would depend upon having automobile entrances and exits for the car wash on Mission Street. Mr. Ohleyer replied in the affirmative, remarking that it would be difficult for the people who do not know the area to use the Tenth Street entrance to the site.

Commissioner Mellon asked if Mr. Ohleyer's statement to the effect that the staff had made a decision at the last minute that automobile access to the car wash should not be permitted from Mission Street was correct. Mr. Steele replied that ISCOTT had met on July 8 and had published minutes of the meeting shortly thereafter which indicated that automobile access to the car wash from Mission Street would not be acceptable. ISCOTT did not believe that the traffic which would be generated by the gasoline pumps would be detrimental to movement on Mission Street; however, since Mission Street carries two-way traffic and since the number of vehicles wishing to take advantage of the car wash might be considerable, it was felt that vehicular access to the car wash should be allowed only from Tenth Street which carries one-way traffic. The staff of the Department of City Planning was also concerned about the fact that additional curb cuts on Mission Street would reduce the amount of sidewalk space available for Muni Railway loading zones.

Commissioner Porter asked if the recommendations of the Department of City Planning are always based on actions taken by ISCOTT. Mr. Steele replied that recommendations on zoning matters are made by the Director of Planning who may be influenced to some extent by the actions of ISCOTT.

President Newman, remarking that the plans of the staff of the Department of City Planning would not allow vehicular access to the car wash from Mission Street, and noting that Mr. Ohleyer had stated that access from Mission Street would be essential to the economic feasibility of the project, asked if the applicants would go forward with the proposed development if the Commission were to approve the concept suggested by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Erik Altree, representing the executor of the Herbst estate, stated that he had not been advised of ISCOTT's July 8 action when he had met with Mr. Passmore of the staff of the Department of City Planning on July 16th. Furthermore, he had left that meeting with a definite understanding that Mr. Passmore had approved of the scheme which would allow vehicular access to the car wash from Mission Street. He stated that he had not seen the scheme which was now being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he indicated that he had heard nothing from the staff of the Department of City Planning since July 16 with the exception of the phone call which he had received earlier in the day advising him that the staff would recommend against access from Mission Street to the car wash. He stated that all of the feasibility studies which had been made of the proposed project had concluded that it would not be economically viable without an entrance from Mission Street; and, in view of the fact that an escape route onto Jessie Street would be provided to assure that congestion of the property would not affect traffic on Mission Street, he hoped that the Commission would approve the plan being proposed by the applicants.



President Newman asked Mr. Altree if he felt that an agreement could be reached with the staff of the Department of City Planning if the matter were to be continued under advisement. Mr. Altree replied that he had been under the impression that an agreement had already been reached with the staff of the Department of City Planning on all aspects of the plan with the exception of the width of the driveways; however, since that had proven not to be the case, he doubted that anything further could be achieved if the matter were to be continued under advisement by the Commission.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he had received in the mail a copy of the plan being proposed by the applicant and had understood that it had been found to be acceptable by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had shared the same understanding.

Commissioner Mellon asked Mr. Carey if 105 feet of sidewalk space would be sufficient for the bus loading operations of the Municipal Railway at the subject intersection. Mr. Carey replied that 75 feet of sidewalk space is available for loading of buses at the present time; and more space is needed. He believed that 105 feet of loading would be sufficient for the purposes of the Municipal Railway until such time as transit congestion in the area is relieved by completion of the Van Ness Avenue Underground Station.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried 5-2 that the subject application be approved and that the applicant be allowed to proceed with the proposed development in accordance with the plans which had previously been mailed to members of the Commission showing an entrance and exit to the car wash from Mission Street. Commissioners Carey, Mellon, Newman, Porter and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioners Fleishhacker and Rueda voted "No".

ZM71.11 - 1231-39 19th Avenue, west line, 150 feet south of Lincoln Way and 1228 20th Avenue, east line, 175 feet south of Lincoln Way.  
R-3 to an R-3-C District.

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Henry Sommer, President of the Irving Street Merchants Association, Inc., requesting that hearing of the subject application be delayed for 30 days in order to give his Association sufficient time to discuss the merits of the proposal. The Secretary also indicated that he had received a telephone call from Mr. Comarada, President of the San Francisco Council of District Merchants, supporting the Irving Street Merchants Association's request for postponement of the hearing.

George Choppelas, attorney for the applicant, stated that he had been contacted by the two organizations which were requesting postponement of the hearing; and he had agreed to the delay. As a result, he had brought neither expert witnesses nor exhibits to the meeting.



President Newman asked for a show of hands by individuals in the audience who wished to be heard on this matter. Since a considerable number of people responded, he indicated that the Commission would be willing to hear their testimony at the present hearing so that they would not have to return in one month.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject parcel of property which has a frontage of 100 feet on 19th Avenue and a frontage of 50 feet on 20th Avenue. The total area of the property is 15,000 square feet. The applicant had requested that the property, which is presently zoned R-3, be reclassified to R-3-C. If the application were approved, the four single-family dwellings on 19th Avenue and the vacant catering facility on 20th Avenue would be razed to make way for the construction of a one-story restaurant covering 1,445 square feet of the lot and a parking lot for 30 cars with an entry and exit on both 19th and 20th Avenues.

Mr. Choppelas stated that he was not prepared to proceed with his presentation since he had understood that the hearing would be postponed.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the application.

Marjorie Lonergan, 1268 20th Avenue, submitted a petition which had been signed by approximately 37 residents of the subject neighborhood in opposition to the applicant's proposal. The people who had signed the petition felt that the proposed change of zone would create a serious and hazardous condition in the area; and they believed that the present zoning of the property should be retained to prevent a mixture of residential and commercial uses in the area.

Rudolph DeVries, representing the local executive board of the Culinary Workers Union, stated that many of the 25,000 members in his union reside in the subject neighborhood; and, on their behalf and on behalf of the other members of the union, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

An agent from Kirby Realty, 1708 Irving Street, stated that he represented two property owners in the neighborhood who were in favor of commercializing the area.

Dick Conroy, 1648 Great Highway, advised the Commission that the Citizens Planning Commission of the Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK) had met on Tuesday, August 3, to discuss the subject application. Although the organization did not ordinarily express itself on such matters, they had voted unanimously to transmit the following statement to the City Planning Commission:

"The Citizens Planning of SPEAK expresses it's disapproval of the proposed rezoning of a section of 19th Avenue which would permit the construction of a McDonald's Hamburger Concession. Our Commission especially notes its concern for the negative example such a rezoning would have on the long-range planning needs of the Sunset-Parkside Area and the entire City, and notes especially that such a concession is inappropriate near a major entrance to Golden Gate Park."



Mrs. Panol, 1269 19th Avenue, stated that a dangerous traffic situation already exists on 19th Avenue; and she felt that construction of a hamburger stand on the subject property with a driveway on 19th Avenue would increase the potential for automobile accidents. In any case, she did not feel that construction of such a commercial use would be appropriate in a residential area.

Marguerite Warren, President of the Sunset Community Improvement Club, stated that she would defer her comments until the next occasion on which the subject application is scheduled for hearing.

Since no one else was present in the audience who wished to speak, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement until the meeting of September 2, 1971.

CU71.33 - 840 and 860 California Street, northwest and northeast corners of Joice Street.

Request for a 266-room hotel in two buildings in the Nob Hill Special Use and Special Height Districts; in an R-5 District.

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from Charles W. Fay, President of the Nob Hill Association, Frederick O. Johnson, President of the University Club of San Francisco, and A. Cal Rossi, President of the A. Cal Rossi Company, Ltd, requesting that the scheduled hearing of the subject application be postponed.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that he was prepared to recommend that the hearing be postponed until the Commission's Regular Meeting on October 7, 1971.

President Newman asked for a show of hands by the individuals present in the audience who wished to be heard regarding the subject application. Based on the response received, he decided that the Commission should hear from the people present before taking the matter under advisement.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He indicated that the parcel of property located on the northeast corner of California and Joice Streets, which has a total area of 6,900 square feet, is occupied by a 30-unit apartment building. The second parcel of property, located on the northwest corner of California and Joice Streets and having a total area of 6,090 square feet, is occupied with four dwelling units, a store, and an office. The properties are zoned R-5 and are located in the Nob Hill Special Use District and the East Slope of Nob Hill 160-foot Special Height District No. 1. He indicated that the applicant proposed to construct a 266-room hotel in two buildings, one 15 stories high on the west corner of Joice Street and the other 11 stories high on the east corner. The street level of the west tower would contain a reception lobby and a restaurant with a bar service. The street level of the east tower



would contain 2,200 square feet of shops. A swimming pool is planned on the roof of the 11-story east tower. The proposal calls for parking garages in both buildings with access from Joice Street and Pratt Place for both garages. The garage in the west tower would be two floors with the only automobile access to the lower floor coming from a below grade connection under Joice Street. A total of 37 off-street parking spaces were proposed, consisting of 6 compact spaces and 31 standard-size spaces. One 10-foot by 25-foot off-street loading space with a height of 12 feet would be provided in the west tower. The proposed buildings would contain the maximum floor area permitted under the floor area ratio applicable to the subject properties; and the buildings would be set back two feet from the right-of-way of Joice Street to increase the width of that street to twenty-one feet six inches.

Mr. Steele stated that any proposal for a building exceeding 160 feet in height in the Nob Hill Special Use District is subject to conditional use review and approval by the Commission. He stated that both of the proposed buildings are less than 160 feet high. The Nob Hill Special Use District also provides that a conditional use may be authorized for a hotel which contains principal commercial uses if they are accessible only from within the hotel. He indicated that the City Planning Code would require 34 off-street parking spaces for the proposed project, four of which could be for compact cars. However, he noted that the City Planning Commission could require additional off-street parking if it so desired. In conclusion, he stated that the R-5 zoning of the properties would permit a total of 104 dwelling units to be constructed or one dwelling for each 125 square feet of lot area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if approval of the proposed project would be entirely at the discretion of the Commission. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative, indicating that the proposed development could not proceed without conditional use authorization by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter asked if Joice Street is a public or private right-of-way. Mr. Steele replied that he believed that it is a public street; and, as a result, revocable permission would have to be granted by the Board of Supervisors before the below grade connection between the garages could be constructed.

Ardi Barton, attorney for the applicant, displayed a picture of the subject neighborhood on which the proposed buildings were superimposed and indicated that a representative of the architect's office was in the audience to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission. He emphasized that no variance would be required for the proposed building; and he pointed out that the buildings would be well within the height, bulk, and other regulations of the City Planning Code.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the applicants proposed to call the proposed hotel the "Pierre" and to use the same type of lettering used by the New York hotel of the same name, asked if there would be any real connection between the two hotels. Mr. Barton replied that the developer of the proposed hotel had previously been associated with the Pierre Hotel in New York when it was under different ownership.



August 5, 1971

Gustav Von Lowenfeld, the proposed developer, stated that he had a registered title to the name "Pierre"; however, he indicated that the proprietor of the facility would be at liberty to choose any name that he might desire. He stated that the proposed hotel would be a "first class" rather than a "luxury" hotel; but he definitely felt that it would complement the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the cost of rooms in the proposed hotel. Mr. Von Lowenfeld stated that the average price for a 14 x 24 foot room with a patio would be \$30 per night.

Ernest Ames, representing John Sardis, architect for the applicant, stated that the parameter established in the City Planning Code had been followed scrupulously in the design of the proposed buildings; and he felt that the buildings would be in conformity with the recommendations contained in the Urban Design Plan, particularly insofar as the taller of the two buildings would be placed higher on the hill to emphasize the natural form of the hill.

Commissioner Porter, remarking that the Commission had approved another hotel on Nob Hill 2½ years ago which had not yet been constructed, asked when construction would start on the subject site if the conditional use application were to be approved. Mr. Barton replied that construction would have to be deferred pending a California Superior Court decision because the subject properties are part of an estate; he estimated, however, that construction would begin in 9 to 12 months.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if he were correct in understanding that the applicants do not presently own the subject property. Mr. Barton replied in the negative, indicating that the application had been filed by the estate of E. A. Lackman. The proposed development, however, would be undertaken by the prospective purchasers of the property who are represented by Midland and Hastings of Palo Alto.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of the subject application.

Don Anderson, representing the University Club, repeated his organization's request that a decision on the subject application be deferred for 30 days. Furthermore, it seemed to him that Section 302 (e) of the City Planning Code would deny the Commission's authority to approve the application because of the pending high-rise initiative which will be considered by the electorate in November. In any case, since the proposed developers had not yet acquired title to the subject property, he did not feel that they would be prejudiced by the delay which had been requested.

Boyd Burnside, President of the Golden Gate Motel Association, feared that construction of the additional guest rooms which have already been authorized in San Francisco may have a damaging effect on people who are involved in the operation of existing motels; and he referred to Hawaii as an example of an area



which has been overbuilt in terms of hotel space and is now suffering economic consequences. He also shared Mr. Anderson's concern about the Commission's authority to act on the subject application while the high-rise question is pending; and he felt that the voters should be given the opportunity to express their opinion on high-rise buildings before any more are approved.

Edward Bielsky, representing the Committee for a Vote on High Rise, felt that the Commission should not even consider the subject application until the Duskin proposal for a ban on high-rise buildings has been considered by the electorate in November. He remarked that a law suit had already been filed to question the Commission's legal right to proceed to hear and act on applications involving high-rise structures while the initiative is pending. In his opinion, the City Planning Code clearly states that a moratorium must be established whenever amendments are proposed to the City Planning Code; and he pointed out that the high-rise initiative, if approved by the voters, would result in an amendment in the City Planning Code. He questioned the earthquake safety of the proposed buildings; and he remarked that the design of the proposed buildings resembled "Waikiki Architecture at its finest". He stated that the Wall Street Journal had reported on the previous day that tourism on the West Coast has declined; and he remarked that the volume of tourists visiting San Francisco has declined over the past two years. The developers of the proposed Hyatt Hotel on Nob Hill had decided not to proceed with that project; and the Princess Hotel, which had already been approved by the Commission, had not yet and probably would not be constructed. Given the decline in tourism, and given the fact that a large number of new hotels are already under construction or on the drawing boards, he did not believe that there would be a demand for the hotel rooms being proposed by the present applicants; and he believed that the only reason that the developers had for proceeding with the project would be to use it as a tax write-off. He remarked that the proposed project would destroy two existing buildings containing a total of 34 dwelling units in addition to a few commercial uses; and he felt that it would not be fair to destroy apartments which are occupied largely by older women who have lived there for many years.

Mr. Steele stated that the City Attorney had ruled that the Duskin initiative does not affect the City Planning Commission's right to hear and decide on any matters which may come before it. Since the Commission's calendar on September 2 is already overcrowded, he recommended that the subject application be taken under advisement until the Commission's regular meeting on October 7, 1971.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement until the meeting of October 7, 1971.

At 3:40 President Newman announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 3:50 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU71.36 - Northeast corner of Baker and Hayes Streets; and northeast corner of Fell and Baker Streets.

Request for an off-street parking lot for 24 cars on the Hayes and Baker Streets site and for an off-street parking lot for 50 cars on the Fell and Baker Streets site; in R-3 and R-4 Districts.



President Newman stated that a letter had been received from the applicant requesting that the scheduled hearing be postponed for one month. He then asked members of the audience if they wished to be heard at the present time. Individuals who were present responded that they would prefer to defer their comments in view of the fact that many residents of the neighborhood had remained at home presuming that the applicant's request for postponement would automatically be approved.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), recommended that hearing of the application be postponed until the meeting of October 7.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject application be postponed until the Commission's regular meeting on October 7, 1971.

CU71.34 - Alemany Boulevard, northwest line, 41 feet southwest of the right-of-way of the proposed Folsom Street Extension.  
Request for an automatic automobile wash in a C-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is an irregularly shaped lot with approximately 347 feet of frontage on Alemany Boulevard and an area of 19,946 square feet. He indicated that the property, which had formally been occupied by a service station and building material storage yard, is presently vacant; and the applicant had proposed to construct an automatic car wash with gasoline dispensing facilities on the site.

Dave Cox, representing C & P Parking, Inc., stated that his firm had been anxious to construct a car wash in the subject neighborhood for the past year. Originally, property to the east had been under consideration; however, that site would have been bisected by the proposed Folsom Street extension. He felt that the property presently under consideration would be extremely adaptable to the use proposed, especially since it has 342 feet of frontage on Alemany Boulevard, which will allow easy ingress and egress of automobiles. In addition, the site would provide a storage capacity for approximately 24 cars. He displayed and described a site plan of the proposed development and indicated that his firm would be willing to install more landscaping than was shown on the plan if such a recommendation should be made by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele remarked that an automatic car wash with gasoline pumps at the subject location would be convenient to residents, workers, and visitors in the College Hill, Portola and Excelsior Districts without bringing objectional disruption to nearby residents or commercial activities. He indicated that the proposed development would have adequate stacking area and that it should not



result in any traffic conflicts; and he remarked that the proposed landscaping would provide amenity to adjacent residential and commercial uses. He recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After reviewing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Cox replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6738 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU71.35 - 550 Bay Street, northeast corner of Jones Street.

Request for a 240-room hotel with accessory commercial space and approximately 180 automobile parking spaces within an enclosed garage; in the Northern Waterfront Special Use and 40-foot Special Height Districts; in a C-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is an irregularly shaped parcel with frontages of 275 feet on Bay Street, 275 feet on Jones Street, and 77 feet on North Point Street. The property has a total area of 48,400 square feet. The applicant had proposed to construct a 241-room hotel on the site. The ground floor would be occupied by a lobby, a coffee shop primarily for hotel guests, meeting rooms, a bank, and enclosed parking for 66 cars. Above the ground floor would be three levels of guest rooms, all of which would be served by interior corridors. A laundry, a mechanical room, and parking for approximately 115 automobiles would be provided below grade. Mr. Steele stated that hotels are generally permitted as a principal use in C-2 Districts; however, they may be permitted only if approved by the City Planning Commission as a conditional use within the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 2. He also indicated that the City Planning Code would require one off street parking space to be provided for each eight guest rooms plus one space for the manager, if any; and, under those standards, the proposed development would require 30 off-street parking spaces. The applicant had proposed to provide approximately 150 parking spaces in excess of the Code requirement; and, as a result, the additional parking spaces would have to be authorized by the Commission as a conditional use because the property is located in Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 2. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the City Planning Commission had previously approved a 243-unit motel on the site; however, that development had never materialized.

James W. Derryberry, the applicant, stated that subject property is presently owned by the Downtowner Corporation which had agreed to sell the property to him and his partners. He indicated that one of his partners had been



in the hotel-motel business for approximately 20 years; and the other partner, the firm of Haas and Haynie, would be the contractors for the proposed development. He stated that the architect for the project was present in the audience to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

In response to a request from Commissioner Ritchie, Mr. Derryberry displayed and described a black light rendering of the proposed building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker noted that the proposed hotel would be approximately the same size as the motel which had previously been approved by the Commission; and he wondered if there were an economic reason for the present applicant's request for permission to construct a hotel rather than a motel. Mr. Derryberry stated that two subterranean levels of parking would have had to be provided for the motel which was previously approved by the Commission; and he indicated that it would not be economically feasible to construct that much underground parking. Whereas 240 parking spaces would have been required for the motel, 181 parking spaces were being proposed for the hotel presently under consideration. Mr. Derryberry also read and submitted a letter which he had received from Howard Johnson, President of the Architectural firm of Howard Johnson and Associates which has offices in the subject neighborhood, in support of the proposed development.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of the subject application.

Boyd Burnside, President of the Golden Gate Motel Association, expressed opposition to the subject application for reasons similar to those which he had expressed earlier in the meeting in opposition to a hotel proposed at California and Joice Streets. He stated that San Francisco is becoming overbuilt in terms of hotel and motel rooms at the same time that tourism is decreasing. Similar problems have arisen in Hawaii, which had enjoyed 90% occupancy of its hotel rooms until 1970 when the occupancy rate fell to 70%. In 1970 San Francisco's hotels and motels had only 71% occupancy; and, if the occupancy rate should drop to 67%, the operators of existing hotels and motels will be in serious trouble. Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Burnside would be opposed to the construction of any new hotel or motel in San Francisco. Mr. Burnside replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Steele stated that construction of a hotel on the subject property would be a desirable development in the Fisherman's Wharf area; and he felt that the site would be appropriate for such a use. He noted that the height of the proposed building would be in conformance with the special height district governing the subject neighborhood; and, in addition, the height of the building would be in conformance with the guidelines contained in the Urban Design Plan. He did not feel that the provision of more off street parking than required by the City Planning Code would create a traffic problem in the area; and, in any case, the parking areas would not be visible from the street. He recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained



in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After reviewing each of the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

President asked if the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would be acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Derryberry replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Rueda and seconded by Commissioner Ritche that the draft resolution be adopted.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he had heard considerable discussion regarding a reduction in tourism in San Francisco; however, no reduction was indicated by the returns from the hotel tax which had shown increases in both 1970 and in 1971. While more hotels and more motel rooms may be vacant than in the past, the actual rate of tourism is increasing.

President Newman noted that the staff of the Department of City Planning had undertaken a study of the need for additional convalescent hospitals when the Commission had been confronted with a large volume of applications for that type of facility; and he wondered if a similar study could now be made of the need for additional hotel and motel rooms in the City. Mr. Steele replied that he would be hesitant to take on a major project of that nature at the present time, particularly since he did not feel that any real problem had yet developed. However, he indicated that he would be willing to look into the matter and report back to the Commission in approximately two months.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6739 and to approve the application subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU71.37 - 208 Portola Drive, northeast corner of Burnett Avenue..  
Request for modification of prior stipulations and for  
authorization to expand a nonconforming gasoline service  
station by the addition of two canopies over two existing  
pump islands; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is an irregular parcel with frontages of approximately 305 feet on Portola Drive and 89 feet on Burnett Avenue with a total area of 20,251 square feet. He indicated that the property is presently occupied by a nonconforming automobile service station with an expiration date of July 16, 1986. The applicant proposed to expand the lot coverage of the existing service station as part of the proposed modernization of the station. The modernization would involve the addition of pump island canopies, landscaping and minor remodeling of the station building. The resulting lot coverage would be 15.7 percent, and increase over the existing coverage of 10.8 percent. He stated that a nonconforming automobile service station may be



altered or reconstructed at the existing or lower lot coverage when the coverage does not exceed 30 percent of the site; however, a stipulation was placed on the property in 1951 by the City Planning Commission which limited the use to a gasoline service station and established a maximum coverage on the site of 15 percent of the entire area. The applicant's present proposal would exceed that coverage limitation.

Jerry Gere, representing the applicant, remarked that additional landscaping would also be added to the site; and he felt that the appearance of the station would be improved considerably. He also indicated that the owner of the nearest adjacent property had seemed to be in favor of the proposed project.

Commissioner Porter asked if anyone had complained about the size of the sign which exists on the property at the present time. Mr. Gere replied in the affirmative and indicated that he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning would recommend that the size of the sign be reduced. He imagined the sign had originally been elevated to its present height by Texaco, Inc. so that it could be seen by motorists on Portola Drive; however, he had not been able to obtain any response from Texaco with respect to the issue of lowering or reducing the size of the sign.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele felt that the proposed project would improve the appearance of the existing use and that it would not be detrimental to the subject neighborhood. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved subject to four specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. In reviewing the conditions, he called particular attention to Condition No. 4 which read as follows:

"The existing sign on the subject property shall be removed.  
The new sign for the station shall not exceed 30 square feet in area  
and not exceed 24 feet in height."

President Newman asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Gere replied that he did not know what the reaction of Texaco, Inc. would be to Condition No. 4; however, since that firm had been willing to change its signs in the past to meet local code requirements, he doubted if there would be any objection to the condition.

President Newman emphasized that any conditions which might be adopted by the Commission would have to be met by the applicants.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6740 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.



CU71.38 - 2352 Pine Street, north line, 132 feet west of Fillmore Street.

Request for conversion of existing dwellings to an animal hospital or clinic; in a C-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has 23.3 feet of frontage on Pine Street, a uniform depth of 137.5 and an area of 3,203.75 square feet. The property is occupied by a single-family dwelling; and the applicant proposed to convert the residential building to an animal clinic which would not board animals or keep them overnight unless emergency or extensive care was necessary. The facade of the building would be substantially unchanged; however, the garage door would be widened to allow easy access under and through the building to rear yard parking. The rear yard would be paved and space would be provided for three staff cars and three client cars.

Lawrence Bennett, the applicant, stated that the building had been vacant for six months; and he indicated that he intended to renovate the building in victorian style as depicted on a rendering which he displayed. Since clients would make appointments by telephone, the parking which would be provided on the site would meet the needs of the facility without requiring use of on-street parking spaces. Animals being brought into the building would enter from the parking lot in the rear and would not appear on the public sidewalk. Animals would not be boarded on the site; and any animals which might be kept overnight would be housed in a soundproofed at the rear of the building. No outside kennels or runs were being proposed; and the trash would be picked up from the facility on a daily basis. In conclusion, Dr. Bennett stated that he had received verbal support for his project from the secretary of the Fillmore Business Association; however, that organization would not be able to take a formal vote on the matter until September.

Commissioner Porter asked how many people would be served by the clinic on an average day. Dr. Bennett replied that about 10 or 12 clients could be expected each day if things go well for the proposed clinic.

In response to a request from President Newman, Dr. Bennett displayed and described floor plans which had been prepared for the two-story building.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of the subject application.

Mrs. Sakai, 2338 Pine Street, stated that she owns a six-unit apartment building immediately adjacent to the subject site. She felt that additional residents are needed in the subject block to improve the residential character of the area and she did not feel that introduction of the proposed commercial use would be desirable.

Masami Sugaya, 2329 Pine Street, also objected to the removal of another dwelling unit from the neighborhood. Furthermore, people who live in the area want peace and quiet at night and would not wish to be disturbed by barking dogs.



The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Robert J. Court who believed that the proposed use would depreciate the value of surrounding properties and would discourage their improvement in the future. He felt that the proposed facility should be located in a more appropriate area of the City.

Commissioner Porter asked if an attendant would be on duty in the clinic at night. Dr. Bennett replied in the negative but indicated that his living quarters are located only one and one half blocks from the site. In any case, animals which would be kept in the building overnight would be critically ill and would not make noise. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Ritchie, Dr. Bennett stated that no more than three or four animals would be kept in the building overnight.

Mr. Steele stated that it had been very difficult for him to evaluate the subject application. The building which occupies the site is one of the most disreputable buildings in appearance in the block. While the property is zoned for commercial use, the character of development in the area is predominantly residential. The applicant had demonstrated very little evidence of public need for the proposed facility; but there is a need for residential units. No specific details have been submitted regarding the applicant's proposals for soundproofing the rooms in which animals would be kept overnight; and, if the soundproofing should prove to be inadequate, the use could become a detrimental element in the neighborhood. After considering those various factors, he recommended that the application be disapproved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he would not be inclined to disapprove the application; however, he was concerned about the applicant's statement to the effect that animals would be kept in the building overnight without an attendant. While he realized that the problem might not be within the province of the City Planning Commission, he did not feel that sick animals should be left unattended; and he wondered if that was a common practice in San Francisco.

Dr. Bennett stated that living quarters would be provided on the site for a night attendant if the Veterinary Association requires that animals being kept overnight be attended. He also stated that the soundproofing being proposed for the holding room had been discussed with the Bureau of Building Inspection.

Commissioner Ritchie agreed with Commissioner Fleishhacker that the subject application should not be disapproved. He felt that the restoration of the building proposed by the applicant would result in a substantial upgrading of the neighborhood. If adequate soundproofing were to be provided, and if living quarters for a night attendant could be included in the plans for the proposed facility, he would be inclined to vote in favor of the application.

After further discussion, Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the application be approved subject to conditions which would provide that the rules and regulations of any professional Veterinary Association regarding night attendance be



observed and that final plans for the facility should be reviewed by the staff of the Department of City Planning so that a determination could be made as to the adequacy of the soundproofing being proposed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ritchie.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he was inclined to vote in favor of the application; however, he felt that it was essential that a night attendant should be on duty if animals are left in the building.

Mrs. Sakai stated that the subject property is part of an estate which has been in probate court, and she indicated that it had deteriorated because it has been vacant for six months.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that another condition should be established by the Commission requiring that the remodeling of the building depicted in the sketch that had been displayed by the applicant be completed within one year and that the staff of the Department of City Planning should have control over the design of the building.

Mr. Steele felt that additional conditions should be established by the Commission which would set standards for waste disposal, prohibit the boarding of animals, and prohibit outside runs. His suggestion was that the matter be taken under advisement so that the staff of the Department of City Planning could prepare specific conditions for review by the Commission.

President Newman stated that he would vote against the subject application because he felt that the proposed use would downgrade the subject neighborhood.

Commissioners Fleishhacker and Ritchie modified their motion and second to provide that the application would be approved in principle subject to specific conditions which would be prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning and adopted by the Commission at its regular meeting on August 12. When the question was called, the motion was carried by a vote of 6-1. Commissioners Carey, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter, Ritchie, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Newman voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular meeting held Thursday, August 12, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 12, 1971, at 1:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; George Carey, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Acting Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; William Proctor, Planner IV; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - (Zoning); DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; William Duchek, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Scott Blakey represented Television Station KQED.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the minutes of meetings of July 21 and 22, 1971, be approved as submitted.

## CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Acting Director of Planning, reminded the Commission that a Field Trip has been scheduled for next Thursday at 1:00 p.m. to visit properties which will be considered during the Zoning Hearing on September 2, 1971.

Mr. Murphy informed the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting last Monday, had postponed for one week its consideration of an appeal from a City Planning Commission decision denying an application for a conditional use for automobile dismantling yards in the South Bayshore area.

Mr. Murphy distributed copies of a draft resolution which had been prepared to authorize an extension of 90 days for work to be done under the contract which had been executed between the Director of Planning and Sedway/ Cooke for a special planning project concerned with Chinatown. Mr. Murphy stated that certification of the contract had been delayed beyond the date of July 18, 1970 because the agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the State of California had not been executed as of that date. After the draft resolution had been read by the Secretary, Mr. Murphy recommended that it be adopted.



After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6741.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), reviewed conditions which he had prepared for inclusion in Resolution No. 6737 which was adopted by the Commission on August 5, 1971, to approve application CU71.30. He stated that the conditions were regarded as acceptable by the applicant.

Commissioner Porter asked if the conditions were satisfactory to the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried 6-1 that the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele be approved for inclusion in Resolution No. 6737. Commissioners Carey, Mellon, Newman, Porter, Ritchie and Rueda, voted "Aye"; Commissioner Fleishhacker voted "No".

Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, advised the Commission that he had responded to a request which had been received from HUD for an estimate of the cost of producing a documentary film on the Urban Design Plan and for reprinting of 5,000 copies of the report. If HUD decides to finance such a project, the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will be requested to authorize the staff of the Department of City Planning to apply for the funds.

Commissioner Porter assumed that the project would not proceed until the Urban Design Plan has been adopted by the Commission. Mr. Macris replied that further correspondence from Washington was not expected until the first of September; and he indicated that the Commission is scheduled to consider adoption of the Urban Design Plan during its meeting on August 26.

#### Status Report on Schematic Design for Upper Market Street

Jack Barron, Project Manager of the Transit Task Force, and Piero Patri of Whisler/Patri Associates, Consultants for the Upper Market Street Project, reported on the Schematic design plans which have been prepared for Upper Market Street and responded to questions which were raised by members of the Commission. Mr. Barron stressed that funds are presently available only for work in the immediate vicinity of the two underground transit stations located on Upper Market Street.

Arthur Middleton, representing the Upper Market Planning Association (UMPA), stated that his organization had given unanimous and unqualified approval to the schematic design plans for Upper Market Street which had just been described.



CU71.28 - 2352 Pine Street, north line, 182 feet west of Fillmore Street.  
Request for conversion of existing dwellings to an animal hos-  
pital or clinic; in a C-2 District.  
(UNDER ADVISEMENT from Meeting of August 5, 1971)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Adminis-  
trator), remarked that the subject application had been taken under advise-  
ment from the meeting of August 5, 1971, to enable the staff of the Department  
of City Planning to draft appropriate conditions for the proposed use. He  
distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared with nine spe-  
cific conditions; and, after reading and commenting on the conditions, he re-  
commended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions were acceptable to the applicant.

Lawrence Bennett, the applicant, replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Steele noted that the Commission had previously expressed concern  
about the fact that the applicant had not proposed to have a night watchman  
on duty when sick animals are kept overnight in the proposed facility. How-  
ever, since it is general practice in the State of California to allow indi-  
vidual veterinarians to make their own decision regarding the need for a night  
watchman, he had not included any requirement for the hiring of a night watch-  
man in the draft resolution.

Mrs. Sakai, 2338 Pine Street, asked what recourse residents of the neigh-  
borhood would have if the premises of the veterinary clinic are not maintained  
in a clean condition or if the animals should prove to be too noisy. Pres-  
ident Newman replied that either circumstance would be in violation of the  
conditions contained in the draft resolution and should be referred to the  
staff of the Department of City Planning for corrective action.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded  
by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be  
adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6742.

R71.34 - Vacation of a portion of Upper Terrace east of Monument Way.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Upper Terrace is a narrow street which begins at the southern  
end of Buena Vista Park and winds its way up to the top of Mount  
Olympus. It is probably an easement street. The roadway and right-  
of-way widths vary, with roadway widths south of Clifford Terrace  
ranging from 30 feet down to 21 feet.



"In the area this referral concerns, where the street makes a U-turn with the base of the "U" parallel and high above 17th Street, the roadway is at its narrowest, 21 feet wide. No sidewalk has been constructed on the south side of the street here where the ground drops off steeply to 17th Street about 60 feet below; there is a low safety wall at the curb line and no parking is allowed. Between the wall and six vacant lots which extend down to 17th Street is a strip of street area varying in width. The petitioners, owners of the six lots, have requested the vacation of a portion abutting their lots which is 18 feet wide along four of them, and which tapers down to nothing along the eastern portion of the curve. A strip varying from 5' to 12 feet wide would be reserved for sidewalk.

"The purpose of the vacation is to give the properties access to Upper Terrace. The value of the lots is in the view, and the higher that buildings can be sited, the better their view. Structures so built would impair the view for the walker and the motorist, but on the other hand, it is a fleeting view for the motorist because parking is not permitted along the wall now.

"Another consideration is what vehicle access to the lots would do to traffic. The situation of cars backing out on the blind curve of Upper Terrace into the strictly local traffic would probably not be as bad as that of cars backing into the heavy 17th Street traffic. In view of the traffic situation on 17th Street as vehicles approach the crest of the hill, it would be desirable to restrict vehicular access to the lots in question from 17th Street.

"The zone is R-2. The six lots fronting the area proposed to be vacated are each entitled to two dwelling units. Four of the lots have only 1750 square feet; the addition of approximately 450 square feet to each of them would not make them eligible for any additional units, since 1500 square feet of lot area is required for each dwelling unit on the lot if there are more than two units. Merging of lots in this case would not increase the allowable density, either, since they are so small to begin with. If all six lots were merged into one and the street area proposed to be vacated added, the total area would be about 13,700 square feet, and nine units would be permitted, which is less than what is permitted with six single lots.

"Construction on the lots will have to deal with the problem of providing off-street parking; in the process, if the proposed street vacation takes place, the owners will have to deal with the problem of providing adequate sidewalk construction and support."

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Thad E. Kusmierski, President of the Board of the Mount Olympus Neighbors Association Inc., as follows:



"With respect to the 'Proposed Vacation of a Portion of Upper Terrace, East of Monument Way' the Board of the Mount Olympus Neighbors Association has taken the following action:

"1) Voted to oppose the vacation because of the apparent increase in density that such a vacation suggests.

"2) Voted to oppose the vacation because of the lack of full information of what proposals the owners of the properties are considering in terms of development.

"Upper Terrace is probably at its narrowest just at the point of this vacation and is barely functioning as a street at this time. We understand that the widening of the street is not very likely but increasing the numbers of cars that use the street effectively 'narrows' it with increased congestion."

Thomas McCormick, owner of one of the six vacant lots abutting the subject portion of Upper Terrace, stated that the sole purpose of the vacation request was to enable the owners of the vacant lots to gain access to their properties from Upper Terrace. He emphasized that the portion of the street area involved in the vacation request is not presently being used as a part of the roadway of Upper Terrace. Through study of maps on file in the Recorder's office, he had determined that an error had been made in the alignment of the street when the original subdivision was laid out in 1890; and, as a result, the legal street area actually fell on a steep slope and could not be used to provide access to adjacent properties. In 1913 the City made an effort to correct the problem by moving the street 20 feet northward; but that action did not solve the access problem faced by the six lots on the south side of the street. In 1942, the City realigned the corner of Upper Terrace and Monument Way by moving it 17 feet northward; but again no solution was offered for the access problem faced by the remaining lots on the south side of the street. However, as a result of the realignment of the corner, the roadway of Upper Terrace would run directly into a building if a decision were made to spend an astronomical sum of money to develop the street along its existing right of way. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the Commission would regard the proposal for vacation of the subject portion of the street as a reasonable request.

Mr. Murphy recommended that the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Upper Terrace be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan on the condition that the owners of the six adjacent vacant lots grant the City vehicular access rights to those lots from 17th Street.

Commissioner Ritchie suggested that action on the proposal should be deferred to enable the members of the Commission to take a field trip to the site.



Mr. McCormick stated that the Department of Public Works had sent inquiries to a number of public agencies asking for their reaction to the proposed street vacation. None of the agencies had expressed any objection to the proposal; however, the Bureau of Traffic Engineering had requested that the proviso be attached to the approval requiring that vehicular access rights to the six vacant lots from 17th Street be granted to the City.

President Newman requested the Secretary to re-read the letter which had been received from the President of the Mount Olympus Neighbors Association, Inc.

Mr. McCormick stated that the proposed street vacation would not increase density in the area as implied in Mr. Kusmierski's letter.

Mr. Murphy asked if it was likely that any of the six vacant lots would be merged. Mr. McCormick replied that he could not answer the question with certainty; however, he felt that any mergers would be unlikely.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the six vacant lots are unbuildable at the present time; and she pointed out that approval of the vacation request, which would allow the lots to be developed, would effectively increase the density of the neighborhood.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of August 19, 1971, and that a field trip be taken to the site at that time.

R71.28 - Proposal to abandon the Fourth Street Overcrossing Project and to move the present site of the Southern Pacific passenger station to Fourth and Townsend Streets.  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of August 5, 1971)

William Proctor, Planner IV, indicated that this matter had been taken under advisement from the meeting of August 5 so that the Commission would have an opportunity to review more detailed maps showing the relationship between new developments proposed in the neighborhood before taking action on the subject proposal. He indicated that he had prepared such a map for review by the Commission; and, after posting it on the wall of the meeting room, he described it in detail and responded to questions which were raised by members of the Commission.

Mr. Murphy repeated the recommendation which he had made during the meeting of August 5, for approval of the proposal subject to the following provisos:

- "(1) Successful negotiations are worked out with appropriate city officials as to equitable payment by the railway of applicable costs.



"(2) The City Planning Commission shall review and approve detailed plans for the new Fourth and Townsend Station structure, to insure:

- (a) An attractive and inviting design;
- (b) Adequate facilities for loading and unloading of passengers for buses, taxis, and private autos, including a large loading plaza on Fourth Street, as well as off-street loading spaces on Townsend Street, and, if needed, on King Street, and provisions for protection from the weather of persons boarding trains and buses during winter storms.

"In addition, it is recommended that the railroad give consideration to improvement of Peninsula train schedules to compensate for time-losses to bus riders and walkers because of the new depot location, including greater frequency of trains in off-peak periods, and addition of more fast peak-hour expresses during peak periods.

"The pattern for improvement of the vacated property in the Third-Townsend-Fourth-King Streets block need not be settled at this time, since this would come before the City Planning Commission under provisions of the City Planning Code when plans are developed for new uses and/or construction on the block to be abandoned for terminal use."

Commissioner Porter asked if the requirement for improvement of Peninsula train schedules was an official recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Murphy replied that the recommendation for improved train schedules was merely a suggestion and should not be considered as a proviso.

William Jaekel, representing the Southern Pacific Railway, felt that the plans which had been prepared for the new commuter station would provide ample protection from the weather for people boarding the trains during winter storms; and he did not feel that construction of "umbrella sheds", which would cost approximately \$400,000, would be warranted.

Mr. Proctor remarked that the length of the "umbrella sheds" at the existing depot is approximately 700 feet; and he did not feel that protective coverings at the new station would have to be that long. The recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning was general rather than specific; and he felt that construction of canopies approximately 4 car lengths long would be sufficient to provide protection for passengers boarding trains during inclement weather. Similar protective coverings will be provided in all of the outdoor BART stations.



Commissioner Mellon remarked that BART, unlike the Southern Pacific, would not provide terminals for its passengers; and, as a result, the canopies would be essential in the BART stations to protect people waiting for trains. Since a passenger terminal would be provided by Southern Pacific, he questioned the necessity of having canopies over the boarding platforms.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the provisos which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning called for an attractive and an exciting design for the new facility and required that detailed plans for the new structure be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Commission, expressed hope that Southern Pacific would prepare more attractive plans for the new facility than those which had been shown to the Commission last week. Furthermore, considering the heavy traffic carried by Fourth Street, he felt that the station should be set back from the street to provide a large loading area and turn-around in front of the building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker did not feel that the Commission should require the Southern Pacific to go to unwarranted expense to construct canopies over the boarding platforms; however, he felt that some type of covering should be provided for at least the front car of arriving trains and the back car of departing trains.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if it would be feasible to relocate the canopies from the existing station to the new station. Mr. Jaekel replied in the negative. He remarked that the City does not provide canopies at Municipal Railway bus stops; and he indicated that the Southern Pacific does not presently provide canopies at any of its commuter stations except in San Jose. Furthermore, since commuters usually carry umbrellas during the rainy season, he did not feel that construction of canopies would be worth the expense involved; and, if the commuters were offered a choice between the canopies and a raise of fare, he felt that they would prefer to do without the canopies. He was not prepared to say that construction of the canopies would necessarily result in an increase in fare; however, before taking a firm position on the question of canopies, he felt that he should be given an opportunity to analyze the cost which might be involved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker noted that the Southern Pacific Railway would save a considerable amount of money by not having to invest in the Fourth Street Overcrossing; and the income from the block which is occupied by the existing station might be significant in the future. Yet, he doubted that the monies to be saved or earned would result in a reduction of commuter fares.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director of Planning be directed to report that the proposal of the Southern Pacific, as recommended by the Director of Public Works in his letter dated May 4, 1971, be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan subject to the provisos which had been recommended by Mr. Murphy and with the additional recommendation that



the railroad give consideration to improvement of Peninsula train schedules to compensate for time losses to bus riders and walkers because of the new depot location, including greater frequency of trains in off peak periods and addition of more fast peak hour expresses during peak periods.

Consideration of final staff recommendations on recreation sites in the Central Waterfront area.

Eugene Sembler, Chief Engineer for the Port Commission, requested that consideration of this matter be deferred until the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning can be reviewed jointly by the Port Commission and the Planning Commission ad hoc Committees for Preparation of a Composite Report on the Waterfront.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the City Planning Commission had been requested to express its own view point regarding plans proposed for the Central Waterfront, questioned the appropriateness of subjecting the staff recommendations to a review by a Committee of the Port Commission. R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), acknowledged that the Board of Supervisors had requested the City Planning Commission to comment upon the plan for the Central Waterfront which had been prepared by the Potrero Hill Residents and Home Owners Council. The report of the staff of the Department of City Planning had already been the subject of a public hearing held by the City Planning Commission; and, if it were to be approved by the Commission, it would become an input to the total waterfront plan which is being prepared by the joint committees of the City Planning Commission and the Port Commission. He did not feel that joint committee review of the recommendations prior to action by the City Planning Commission would be appropriate.

Mr. Sembler felt that the City Planning Commission should have the benefit of the Port Commission's comments before taking action on the staff recommendations; and he felt that it would be desirable for the Committees of the two Commissions to discuss the matter jointly. Commissioner Porter agreed.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that the comments of the Port Commission should be submitted to the City Planning Commission in written form. Mr. Sembler indicated that a written statement would be prepared for submittal to the City Planning Commission.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that consideration of the staff recommendations on recreation sites in the Central Waterfront be postponed until the meeting of August 19, 1971.

At 2:50 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.



3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

Discretionary Review of Building Application No. 398946 for an Apartment Building at 1150 Lombard Street, between Hyde and Larkin Streets.

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"This Building Application has been scheduled for consideration by the City Planning Commission under its power of discretionary review on August 12, 1971, because of the extraordinary impact that the proposed apartment building would have upon the city as a whole, and upon the residents and property of the Russian Hill neighborhood. Review was requested by the Russian Hill Improvement Association and was authorized by the Plan Implementation Committee of the Planning Commission.

"The Proposal

"The site was assembled by the early 1960's and has remained vacant since that time. It measures 170 feet along Lombard Street and 195 feet along Chestnut, with no frontage on either Larkin or Hyde. The average elevation along Chestnut is 36 feet lower than along Lombard.

"The American Savings and Loan Association is the owner of the site, and is reported to be offering it for development at a fixed price. The present proposal is by the William C. Haas Company of Kansas City as developers, with Knorr-Elliott and Associates as architects.

"This proposal is for 280 units of luxury housing, fewer than the 400 units permitted by R-5 zoning on this site of 50,004 square feet. The floor area ratio would be 7.6:1, less than the ratio of 10.3:1 permitted in R-5. The developers also point out that the apartment structure would cover only 24 per cent of the site, compared with a coverage limit of 75 per cent in the Planning Code. Off-street parking would more than meet the Code requirements, with 340 spaces provided instead of the 280 spaces required.

"Despite these factors the building has nevertheless achieved an enormous size, and it is the over-all dimensions that are of greatest concern to the city and the neighborhood: the long (east-west) dimension would be 170 feet, and the height 342 feet, making the building severely out of proportion with other development on Russian Hill. In addition, the garage structure would be incompatible with the surrounding area.



"It is very important to note that a number of other potential developers of this site have contacted the Department of City Planning before beginning their designs or when their plans were at an early schematic stage. The developers who have filed this application for a site permit, however, have not made such previous contact, and have asked for quick review, indicating that no changes would be made in the basic scheme submitted. The developers contend that the scheme submitted is the only one feasible in view of the high, fixed asking price for the land. They contend, also, that they are committed to this development by a substantial deposit given to the seller, though it would appear that this move has been made by the developers at their own risk. The lack of preliminary contact with the Department staff concerning a project of this magnitude is extremely unusual.

"Urban Design Terms of Reference"

"The staff indicated in early discussions with the other potential developers for this site that the Department had certain urban design terms of reference intended to maintain the character of the Russian Hill area. These guidelines were put in writing on April 19, 1971.

"The terms of reference for the site are derived in large part from guidelines of the citywide Urban Design Study that were published in preliminary reports, especially Report No. 8 released last October. These guidelines are set forth in greater detail in the widely-circulated Urban Design Plan published in May 1971. The application for the subject building was filed July 7, 1971.

"In the Urban Design Plan, Russian Hill is recognized as an 'outstanding and unique' area of San Francisco, characterized by 'a harmonious, balanced relationship of low, small-scale older buildings and tall, slender towers.' The hill has a 'rich background' of 'varied and well-tended landscaping', and has 'highly detailed buildings ... that articulate the hill.' These descriptions are contained in the portion of the Urban Design Plan on Conservation, where it is indicated that the special characteristics of Russian Hill need protection from inconsistent new development, and that special review may be required, preferably with the participation of neighborhood associations.

"In the Urban Design Plan Guidelines for Height of Buildings, Russian Hill is shown to have a prevailing height of 40 feet, with point towers in the vicinity of the top of the hill. Point towers are defined as buildings that are slender in shape with a high ratio of height to width. This concept is amplified by the Guidelines for Bulk of Buildings, which specify for Russian Hill, above a height of 40 feet, a maximum plan dimension of 110 feet and a maximum diagonal plan dimension of 140 feet. In addition to the Height and Bulk Guidelines, there are many other policies in the Urban Design Plan relating to residential development on Russian Hill and elsewhere in the city.



"Deficiencies in the Building Scheme Submitted

"A. Horizontal Dimensions. The scheme submitted has a plan dimension (the east-west wall) of 170 feet as compared with a maximum of 110 feet in the Urban Design Plan, and a diagonal plan dimension of 184 feet compared with a maximum of 140 feet in the Plan. These dimensions exceed the Plan by 55 per cent and 31 per cent respectively.

"No existing tall building on Russian Hill approaches the dimensions of this proposed structure. In fact, only one such building (1000 Green Street, which is 118 feet in its plan dimension) even slightly exceeds the Bulk Guidelines. The buildings at 1080 and 1090 Chestnut have a combined width of only 140 feet along Chestnut Street. In comparison with buildings of high bulk elsewhere than on Russian Hill, the proposed building in its plan dimension would exceed the Crystal Palace apartments by 38 feet, the Fontana Apartments (each building) by 7 feet, and 1200 California by 50 feet. The Comstock Apartments would exceed this building, however, by some 48 feet.

"B. Height. In the Urban Design Plan, no specific upper limit is established for building heights at the top of Russian Hill. It is stated, however, that point towers would be permitted only as an exception to the prevailing height of 40 feet, with spacing of towers to maintain the open character of the hill. In the urban design terms of reference prepared for the subject site last April, it was stated that a building on the hill should not significantly exceed 300 feet, the height of the Summit Apartments (the Royal Towers Apartments are slightly taller than the Summit, but are located below the crest of the hill). The building proposed would be 342 feet in height, significantly more than 300 feet.

"Furthermore, the height of a building such as this one must be evaluated with its horizontal dimensions taken into account, for both contribute to the bulk of the building on the skyline. The proposed structure would have a wall area on its larger wall of 58,000 square feet, which exceeds the area of a single wall of the Summit by 86 per cent, the Fontana by 82 per cent, 1200 California by 78 per cent, and the very bulky Comstock by 55 per cent. With this type of relationship to other buildings, the proposed structure would impose a new and larger scale on Russian Hill, possibly to an even greater extent than the Bank of America does in the financial district.

"C. Facade Treatment. It is not possible to determine, from the plans submitted, precisely what facade treatment may be proposed for the north and south walls of the building. However, it is doubtful that even an exceptional treatment of these walls could reduce the apparent bulk appreciably.



"The east and west walls would be at the property lines and would have no windows, presenting blank masonry for a width of 69 feet and a height of 342 feet. The applicants have stated that the concrete on these end walls would be patterned to relieve the blankness, but it is possible that such a treatment in the finely-scaled Russian Hill area would only serve to accentuate the massive-ness of the walls.

"D. Lower Elements of the Project. A certain effort has been made in the lower portion of the development to achieve a consistency with past development, especially with landscaping on the roof of the garage. However, this garage presents a forbidding front opposite the houses on Chestnut Street, with a length of 195 feet and height of 45 feet. For comparison, the existing retaining wall along Chestnut is only 15 feet high, while the trees over the wall rise to about 45 feet above the street. The pine and cypress trees on the site would be removed, and replaced with new trees with only limited space for their root systems. Along its sides, the garage would be at the rear property lines of houses on Hyde and Larkin Streets, rising to heights varying from 17 to 45 feet above grade. Though the roof of the garage has been described as a "park", it would not be open to the public and because of the tall slab south of it this area would have a climate characterized by shadow and strong winds. These same conditions would also extend to other properties nearby. In short, the garage structure would not be a good neighbor for the housing that surrounds it.

"With respect to the garage, the staff has determined that the urban design terms of reference written last April should be modified in one detail. Whereas item B(1) of these design terms stated that 'if possible, all access should occur from Chestnut Street,' it now appears, after consultation with the Division of Traffic Engineering, that traffic flows in the area would be as well or better served by having access to this site on Lombard, as in the plans submitted, rather than on Chestnut."

Ronald J. Pengilly, attorney for the applicant, distributed a brochure to members of the Commission which contained photographs of the subject site from various vantage points throughout the city with the proposed building superimposed, a report from Kenneth H. Beesmer, Head Meteorologist with Murray-McCormick Environmental Group in Sacramento, and a written review of the Department of City Planning's Urban Design Plan by the Urban Design Committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. He then stated that Mr. Svirsky had failed to mention one of the most salient features about the plans which had been submitted, i.e. that they comply with the law as it pertains to the subject parcel of property in every single respect. The proposed building would have a height of 33 stories, would be white in color, and would have a facade of architecturally treated concrete. The plans for the proposed building would meet most of the design terms of reference which had been prepared by the staff



of the Department of City Planning for another developer who proposed a different project on the site; however, the building would exceed the maximum diagonal plan dimension of 140 feet which had been recommended in the design terms of reference. In addition, the proposed building would exceed the 300-foot height limit which earlier had been specified by the staff. While Mr. Svirsky had stated that the proposed building would have a height of 342 feet, Mr. Pengilly felt that this calculation must have included the elevator penthouses which are not ordinarily considered in such computations. His own staff had established the height of the proposed building at 325 feet, which would constitute only an 8% variance from the 300-foot height which had earlier been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He emphasized that the earlier design terms of reference had specified that the building proposed for the site should not "significantly" exceed 300 feet; and he did not feel that an exception of 8% should be considered "significant", especially in view of the fact that the subject property is not subject to any legally established height limit. He stated that the proposed building would cover only 24% of the site; and, whereas 400 dwelling units would be allowed by the City Planning Code, only 280 dwelling units were being proposed. A total of 371 (Sic.) parking spaces would be provided on the site even though only 280 parking spaces would be required by the City Planning Code. A garden area of approximately 35,000 square feet would be provided on the roof of the garage.

Mr. Pengilly remarked that the maximum plan dimension and the maximum diagonal plan dimensions proposed on pages 94 and 95 of the Urban Design Plan have not been enacted into law and have not, in fact, been included in pending legislation. Thus, the height and bulk of the proposed building would legally be governed only by a floor area ratio; and, in terms of the floor area ratio applicable in an R-5 zoning district, the applicants would have a very carefully underdeveloped site.

Mr. Pengilly questioned some of the figures which the staff of the Department of City Planning had used in comparing the proposed building to other buildings which presently exist in the subject neighborhood. In comparing the proposed building to the Fontana Apartments, the staff had based its comparison on only one of the Fontana Towers; and he pointed out that the statistics would have been much different if both towers had been included in the computation. The map prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning had indicated that the combined east-west plan dimension of 1080 and 1090 Chestnut Street equals 140 feet. Yet, statistics which were included on the same map showed the plan dimension of 1090 Chestnut Street to be 80 feet and the plan dimension of 1080 Chestnut Street to be 74 feet, for a total of 154 feet. Mr. Svirsky explained that each plan dimension is based upon the longest wall of the building, and one or both of the buildings in question have their longest walls running north-south; the greater combined dimension, however, running east-west, is 140 feet.



Mr. Pengilly stated that his computations had indicated the diagonal plan dimension of 1080 Chestnut Street was 184 feet, and that the combined diagonal plan dimensions of 1080 and 1090 Chestnut Street totaled 220 feet; and he noted that the proposed building, which would occupy a larger parcel of property, would have a diagonal plan dimension of only 184 feet. As suggested in the Urban Design Plan, an alternate to the building being proposed might be to construct two towers on the site instead of one. However, after studying three alternate proposals, including one which would have called for construction of some town houses, the applicants had become thoroughly convinced that construction of two towers would involve more problems than construction of a single tower. If two towers were to be constructed, they would be taller than the building now being proposed; and, as illustrated on a sectional sketch which he displayed, two towers would block more views than the single one being proposed. Yet, the twin towers would conform to the diagonal plan dimension recommended in the Urban Design Plan; and they would contain 400 dwelling units instead of the 280 units proposed for the single tower.

Mr. Pengilly stated that the applicant had a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the maximum plan dimension of 110 feet and the maximum diagonal plan dimension of 140 feet as recommended in the Urban Design Plan; and he remarked that other people who had not been associated with the proposed project, such as the Urban Design Committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, had also raised questions regarding the maximum dimensions which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. That Committee had stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had made no effort to reconcile the new bulk measurements with the existing floor area ratio controls; and it appeared to the Committee that the new bulk measurement would encourage full site coverage up to prevailing building heights. The Committee had also observed that the new guidelines would probably not directly improve the quality of the pedestrian environment. Mr. Pengilly remarked that the guidelines proposed on page 94 of the Urban Design Plan were extremely difficult to understand, particularly in view of the comments which the staff had made on point towers; and he questioned whether the new guidelines would ever be enacted into law. In any case, he felt that the Commission had no basis for disapproving the subject permit application since the proposed building complies in all respects with all existing laws.

Mr. Pengilly noted that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been critical of the fact that the applicant had not contacted the Department before filing the building permit application; however, since the proposed building would meet almost all of the urban design terms of reference which had previously been drawn up for the site, he did not see why any contact with the staff would have been necessary. Furthermore, mistakes had been made in the original design terms of reference as evidenced by the fact that the Department of City Planning had originally specified that all access to the garage should be from Chestnut Street and had later changed its mind, calling for access from Lombard Street. The proposed building had been designed with automobile access from Lombard Street. None of the rest of the design terms of reference had been of great significance except for the standard which had been set for the width



of the building; and the building which was being proposed would not conform to that standard. Yet, the nationally recognized architects who had designed the proposed building had conformed to all existing laws; and, as a result, the applicants had not felt that consultation with the staff of the Department of City Planning would be necessary. In any case, it seemed to be very difficult for the staff of the Department of City Planning to find time to meet with people who have applications on file, not to mention people who have not yet developed their plans to the point of filing for a permit.

Mr. Pengilly remarked that objections had been raised regarding the design of the facade of the proposed building; however, since the facade had not yet been designed, he did not understand the basis for the objections. He indicated, however, that the building would be white in color and that the facade material would be architecturally treated to avoid the appearance of blank walls. The staff of the Department of City Planning had also been critical of the lower elements of the project which would front on Chestnut Street; however, the applicants had since modified their plans to call for a "stepping up" of the garage from Chestnut Street to allow for planting of additional landscaping. The vacant lot presently has an outline which is the same shape as the proposed garage, the only difference being that the garage will have an elevation slightly higher than the existing terrain. The existing retaining wall would be removed; and the new garage wall would be finished with architecturally treated concrete. Information regarding the type of concrete work to be done had already been given to the staff of the Department of City Planning and to the Russian Hill Improvement Association. In addition to using architecturally treated concrete, the applicants would also be willing to improve the appearance of the neighborhood by planting street trees along both Lombard and Chestnut Streets for the full length of the block if permission could be obtained from the City; and the appearance of Chestnut Street would certainly be improved by the 35,000 square foot garden which would be constructed. He stated that a budget in excess of \$20,000 had been set aside for landscaping on the site; and he indicated that a number of 30-foot trees would be purchased at a cost of \$600 each for planting in the garden. However, since submittal of a landscaping plan had not been required, and since the applicants had been busy with the site permit, the landscaping plan had not yet been prepared.

Mr. Pengilly stated that the applicants had made a conscious effort to meet with the Russian Hill Improvement Association in an attempt to resolve their difficulties. They had met with Mrs. Hinman on July 20; and, while she had indicated that the Russian Hill Improvement Association would probably be opposed to the project, she had stated that she would make arrangements for a meeting between members of the Association and the applicant's architects. Since he had heard no further from Mrs. Hinman, he had telephoned her on Tuesday, August 10, and had been advised that no time had been made available for a meeting and that the Russian Hill Improvement Association would prefer to wait until the scheduled Commission hearing to discuss the matter. Another group on Russian Hill represented by Putnam Livermore, had indicated that they would not be opposed to the proposed project.



Mr. Pengilly displayed photographs of the neighborhood which had been taken from various perspectives and upon which he stated the proposed building had been superimposed in accurate scale. He noted that the proposed garden, as seen from the air, would augment the green strip which flows down the slope of the hill. In terms of automobile traffic, he estimated that the proposed building would add a maximum of only two additional automobiles, one in and one out, per minute during peak hours; and he indicated that Mr. Marconi of the Division of Traffic Engineering had been of the opinion that the additional traffic would not create any problems in the area. The Fire Department had raised no objections to the plans. If the City were willing, the applicants would be willing to plant trees along the entire frontage of Lombard and Chestnut Streets and to repave Lombard Street in front of the proposed building with bricks.

Mr. Pengilly stated that he had seen the petitions which had been circulated on Russian Hill in opposition to the proposed project; and he felt that the rendering of the proposed building as depicted on the petition was a gross misrepresentation of the actual size of the building. He believed that the rendering which had been used had exaggerated the size of the building by a full 100% and that it had depicted the height and width of the building to be 50% greater than was actually being proposed. To illustrate his point, he displayed an enlarged photograph of the picture which had been circulated with the petition with his version of the actual size of the building colored in yellow; and he indicated that the architect who had prepared renderings of the proposed building from various vantage points for the applicant would be willing to explain the method which he had used to the Commission.

Mr. Pengilly remarked that the opponents of the proposed project were of the opinion that the building would cause serious wind problems in the area; however, the meteorologist who had been hired by the applicant had concluded that the proposed structure would not increase the wind velocity across and close to the broad faces of the structure from west to east by more than 5 miles an hour. The wind velocity at ground level might be increased by one mile per hour; however, neither an increase nor a decrease in the height of the building would have significant effect on the wind flow at ground level. If the building were to be only three stories in height, it would have the same wind effect as the building presently under consideration.

Mr. Pengilly also remarked that opponents of the proposed project had claimed that it would cast all of Ghirardelli Square in shadow; however, shadow studies which had been made for the applicant had indicated that shadows from the building would not reach Ghirardelli Square even in December when shadows are at their longest. He displayed and described shadow-grams which had been prepared to reflect the effect of the proposed building at various times of day on various days throughout the year; and he emphasized that no shadows whatsoever would be cast by the building on foggy days. In any event, many people, including himself, like shadows.



AUGUST 12, 1971

Mr. Pengilly emphasized that the proposed building conforms to all existing laws. While the Urban Design Plan may be a good working paper, it has not been enacted into law and cannot, according to Mr. Kenealey of the City Attorney's office, even be considered as pending legislation. Mr. Kenealey had also advised him that the applicants were entitled to their permit unless extenuating circumstances were applicable; and Mr. Kenealey had authorized him to report that statement. Mr. Pengilly believed that the proposed building would be a positive element in the Cityscape and that it would not destroy Russian Hill; furthermore, the building would implement the policy stated in the Urban Design Plan which calls for high buildings to be placed on the top of hills to accentuate the topography of the City. In conclusion, he stated that he appreciated the effect which the present political climate, including the Duskin Initiative and the staff of the Department of City Planning's Urban Design proposals, might have on the City Planning Commission. However, he remarked to the Commission that ours is a government of laws and not of individuals; and, in terms of law, he felt that his client had a right to his permit. Therefore, he urged the Commission to approve the permit application promptly.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the subject property is presently owned by the William C. Haas Company. Mr. Pengilly replied in the negative but indicated that his client had contracted to purchase the property.

Commissioner Ritchie then asked if the purchase had been made contingent upon approval of the proposed building by the City Planning Commission. Mr. Pengilly replied that his client would not be required to complete the purchase if he could not obtain a site permit. However, he was not sure whether the \$165,000 deposit which had been paid would be returned if the purchase was not completed. In reply to a further question raised by Commissioner Ritchie, Mr. Pengilly stated that the purchase contract was not tied in any way to the specific building under consideration; it had merely stated that the purchase would be contingent upon his client's ability to obtain "a site permit".

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the total number of stories in the proposed building. Mr. Pengilly replied that the tower could have 33 stories and that the garage would have four levels.

Commissioner Ritchie then asked about the amount of floor space which would be available on each floor of the proposed tower; and, upon being advised by the architect for the applicant that each floor would contain approximately 11,000 square feet of floor area, he estimated that the entire tower would contain approximately 360,000 square feet of floor area. He then asked about the elevation of Lombard Street in front of the subject property as measured from the Bay. The architect replied that the elevation of Lombard Street at that point is 260 feet and that the height of the proposed building to the top of the penthouse would be 342 feet above Lombard Street, thus placing the height of the building at approximately 600 feet above the Bay. In reply to further questions raised by Commissioner Ritchie, the architect stated that apartments in the proposed building would range in size from 1,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet and that the apartments would be rented rather than sold.



Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the shadow-grams had not made it clear to him whether the 35,000 square foot garden would enjoy sunlight. Mr. Pengilly replied that the entire garden would be entirely in shade at noon in June; but he pointed out on the shadow-grams that a triangular half of the garden would be in sunshine during the morning hours of the same day and that another triangular half of the garden would enjoy sunshine in the afternoon. In any case, his own garden at home is located on the north side of the house; and, even though the garden may be in shade a great deal of the time, it is nevertheless the place where he enjoys spending his leisure time.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the plaza on the north side of the Bank of America tower is rarely reached by sunshine.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Pengilly to elaborate on Mr. Kenealey's preliminary unofficial opinion regarding the Commission's discretionary review of the subject permit application. Mr. Pengilly stated that Mr. Kenealey's opinion was unofficial insofar as it had not been rendered in writing; however, Mr. Kenealey had given him permission to state that the Commission should approve the permit unless the Commission could find sufficient compelling reasons for denying the application. As an example of the type of situation under which the permit application might be disapproved, Mr. Pengilly cited the example of a church which failed to receive a permit for a new building because the new building would have been located at the end of a 300 foot cul-de-sac with limited access, thus creating a difficult situation for fighting fires.

Commissioner Porter informed Mr. Pengilly that the City Planning Commission has historically exercised the right of discretionary review; and, even though the decision of the Commission might not be upheld in any given instance, that would not affect the Commission's right to exercise its due discretion.

President Newman made the following statement:

"The power of discretionary review has long standing in this community, and it has been exercised by the City Planning Commission in the past in other cases where a building proposal would have had an extraordinary impact upon the fragile makeup of the City and its neighborhoods.

"The City Attorney has consistently advised that the City Planning Commission has this review power in the case of any building permit application, and that the power goes beyond existing zoning restrictions when those restrictions are deemed inadequate and the effects of the proposed development would be exceptionally great. Because the power extends to every application, there need not be a prior policy of review.

"In the present case, review by the Commission was requested by the Russian Hill Improvement Association and was authorized by a three-member committee of the Commission."



Mr. Pengilly stated that he did not question the Commission's right to conduct discretionary reviews of permit applications; however, he did question the scope of the Commission's discretionary review authority. He remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning had referred to the impact which the proposed building would have on the neighborhood; yet, he believed that pedestrians walking on Chestnut, Hyde or Larkin Street would not be able to see the proposed building. While it would be possible to see the building from Lombard Street or the tennis courts to the south, the first street to the north from which the building would be visible would be Bay Street.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the subject building application.

Dr. Frank Hinman, Jr., President of the Russian Hill Improvement Association, remarked that his organization has a long record of working for the best type of development for Russian Hill and for the city as a whole; and he indicated that his organization was completely in accord with the policies stated in the Urban Design Plan. He did not feel that the building presently under consideration would be good for Russian Hill or for the city as a whole; and, as a result, the members of his organization were more "up in arms" than they had been for a number of years. He then introduced four individuals who were going to make presentations in opposition to the subject building permit application on behalf of the Russian Hill Improvement Association.

James Mallot, an architect and a resident of Russian Hill, indicated that he was prepared to comment on several features of the proposed building which had disturbed residents of the subject neighborhood. He indicated that the building, which would rise 600 feet above sea level, would have the fourth highest rooftop in San Francisco. Because the building would be located on the south side of its own plaza, the plaza would be in shade for a substantial portion of the day; however, most of the shadows would fall on the surrounding community which would be affected by them for most of the day. He stated that he had been involved in wind studies at Harvard University which had been documented in the Architectural Forum; and he testified that tall buildings, such as the one presently under consideration, do cause very heavy downdraft. He estimated that the velocity of wind at the base of the building could be as high as 1½ times the velocity of the wind hitting the face of the building; and, because a vacuum rather than a high pressure area would be present at the lobby entrance to the building, the velocity of the wind at that point could be 2.1 times the velocity of the wind hitting the face of the building. He remarked that the architects of the proposed building had not provided any transition from surrounding buildings which have a height of only 2, 3, or 4 stories; and he pointed out that most of the buildings in the area with the exception of 1000, 1080 and 1090 Chestnut Street are actually low-rise, small-scale buildings. He estimated the height of the proposed building to be greater than the 325 feet claimed by Mr. Pengilly. In any case, the building would have solid walls immediately adjacent to the abutting properties on both sides; and he did not believe that any amount of architectural treatment by a concrete precaster



could soften the effect of blank walls with dimensions of 69 feet by 330 feet. While Mr. Pengilly had emphasized that the proposed tower would cover only 24% of the site, Mr. Mallot pointed out that the garage would effectively cover the remainder of the site; and he remarked that the garage would have high walls along the side property lines and along Chestnut Street. While the applicants proposed to provide more parking than is required by the City Planning Code, he estimated that at least one-half of the 280 families occupying the building would own a second car. Thus, while the applicant proposed to provide more parking spaces than the Code requires, the building would still have an insufficient amount of parking spaces to serve the needs of its residents, not to mention the parking demand which would be generated by visitors to the building. He noted that the garden which had been described by Mr. Pengilly is separated from the public by high retaining walls; and no indication had been given that the garden would be open for public use. Thus, if the proposed building were to be constructed, the community would lose sunlight, privacy, air, and trees and in return would get downdraft winds, shadows, blank walls and traffic problems. Furthermore, if such a trend were to be established, the entire crest of Russian Hill could be developed with similar buildings; and even the views from the building presently being proposed would be destroyed. Mr. Mallot doubted that the applicants had made test borings at the site; and, if blasting were required for the foundation work, he wondered what effect the blasts would have on the two reservoirs located nearby to the south and to the north. Also, if the building were constructed as proposed, he wondered if the applicants would later take advantage of the additional density allowance allotted by the City Planning Code and exploit the site by constructing town houses in the garden area. While Mr. Pengilly had indicated that the applicants intended to plant 30-foot trees in the garden area, he pointed out that the plans for the building would limit the depth of planter boxes on the roof of the garage to one foot; and, since trees develop roots systems similar in size to their branches, he doubted that 30-foot trees could be accommodated unless the plans for the garden were to be altered. Yet, if additional dirt were to be provided, the elevation of the garage would be increased. In conclusion, Mr. Mallot defended the scale of the rendering of the proposed building which appeared on the photograph accompanying the petition circulated on Russian Hill in opposition to the permit application. He stated that he had acquired a plat of the area from a title insurance company; and, by using the known distance from the retaining wall at Larkin Street to the west wall of the house on Lombard Street at the eastern edge of the site, both of which appeared in the photograph, he had established a proper and accurate scale for his rendering. He believed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had verified the accuracy of his rendering.

Mr. Svirsky stated that the Department of City Planning staff had checked the scale of the rendering which had been superimposed on the photograph, using another method as well as Mr. Mallot's main method, and had found it to be substantially correct. If anything, the rendering might have been too short, based on a building height of 342 feet as indicated on the building plans filed with the application. The height of the proposed building was somewhat in dispute insofar as Mr. Pengilly had stated that the 342-foot figure on the face of



the application had included the penthouse and that the actual height of the building exclusive of the penthouse would be 325 feet; however, Mr. Svirsky did not understand how Mr. Pengilly had arrived at that figure by subtracting the five-foot height shown in the plans for the penthouse from the total 342-foot height of the building.

Mr. Mallot also displayed photographs which he had taken of the subject property with the proposed building superimposed from various vantage points; and, while he admitted that those photographs did not have clear reference points such as the retaining wall which appeared in the photograph distributed with the petition, he felt that the scale of the building as portrayed was accurate.

Jack Welch, 1080 Chestnut Street, distributed copies of a report prepared for the Russian Hill Improvement Association which contained extracts from the Urban Design Plan with principles and policies of particular relevance to Russian Hill highlighted by a yellow overlay; the report also contained extracts from the Commission's regular meeting on October 8, 1970, when the subject of design review was under discussion. He called particular attention to the fact that the Urban Design Plan had contained a statement characterizing Russian Hill as having "a harmonious, balanced relationship of low, small-scale older buildings and tall, slender towers." He did not expect the Commission to read the report he had presented immediately; and he did not wish to take the time which would be required to summarize the report during the present hearing. Instead, he hoped that the Commission would postpone action on the subject building permit application until a later date to provide themselves an opportunity to study the report and to enable the staff of the Department of City Planning and the Russian Hill Improvement Association to work further with the applicants in an attempt to arrive at better plans for the proposed project.

Matthew Weinberg, attorney for the Russian Hill Improvement Association, agreed with the Commission that it does have a right to exercise its discretionary review over building permit applications which may comply with the law in every single respect. He stated that there is no vested right in zoning for property owners or for people with options to buy a property; and he indicated that a great many court decisions had been rendered on that issue. As a case in point, he cited an instance in which a court had ruled that a property owner had no vested interest in his property which would make future zoning inoperative in spite of the fact that the property owner had already obtained a grading permit and had expended \$500,000 on a development project. Mr. Weinberg regarded the present situation as a race between the applicant wishing to obtain his permit on the one hand and, on the other hand, the culmination of the hard work of the staff of the Department of City Planning toward adoption of the Urban Design Plan as an element of the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco. He pointed out that the applicant had not spent money for preparation of costly architectural plans; nor had he spent money for purchase of the subject property. In any case, he believed that the City Planning Commission would have a right to conduct a discretionary review of the building



permit application even though the City Planning Code might allow a building three times as large as the one being proposed to be constructed on the site.

Mr. Weinberg questioned whether the Commission had sufficient information to approve the subject permit application even if it so desired, especially since Mr. Pengilly had indicated that no facade design had been prepared for the building and that the design of the garage fronting on Chestnut Street was being changed; and, since the Commission can rule on only what is before it, he felt the Commission would be well advised to postpone action on the matter until more information is available. Yet, if the Commission were to act during the present meeting, he hoped it would deny the permit application on the basis that the proposed building would clearly violate the principles and policies contained in the Urban Design Plan. He remarked that ample evidence of the Commission's authority to deny a permit for a building which complies with all existing laws and ordinances when zoning changes are proposed could be found in the 1967 court decision in the case of the Russian Hill Improvement Association against the Board of Permit Appeals; and he indicated that he would be willing to bring that case and other similar cases to the attention of Mr. Kenealey to clear up any dispute which might exist regarding the Commission's discretionary review authority. He remarked that the Urban Design Plan, which had taken two years of staff time and a great deal of money to prepare, is scheduled to be adopted as an element of the Master Plan on August 26; and, because of that fact, he felt that the Commission had a perfect legal right to disapprove the subject building permit application. In fact, he stated that numerous cases are on record in which permits have been revoked after they have been issued when the public interest was at stake. If the Commission were to approve the subject building application, he wondered what the real point of the Urban Design Study will have been; and he remarked that our laws are not so fickle that they would allow the building under consideration to be approved only two weeks before the Commission is scheduled to take action on the Urban Design Plan. He urged that the permit application be disapproved; and he suggested that the Commission should add the following clause to the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning:

"Whereas, there are contemplated changes in the Zoning ordinance based upon studies long considered by the Planning Commission and based upon the Urban Design Plan which has been developed over a period of two years after many man hours of both Planning staff and citizens; and whereas the zoning change shall be for the public health, safety, and welfare; and whereas these changes shall be made within a reasonable time; and whereas the proposed development would be prohibited by the contemplated zoning;".

Peter Hockaday submitted a letter addressed to Mr. Newman which had been signed by 531 residents of Russian Hill and which read as follows:



"We on Russian Hill are asking for your assistance in a very urgent matter.

"It has come to our attention that a proposed 33-story apartment building on Chestnut Street (between Hyde and Larkin) will be coming before your Planning Commission for Discretionary Review on August 12, 1971. We also understand that the proposed Urban Design Plan will come before your Commission two weeks later - on August 26.

"Because the proposed building does not conform to the Urban Design Plan, in bulk and height, we urge you to defeat or delay this proposal until your Commission has formally adopted the Urban Design Plan, and until guidelines for Russian Hill are detailed.

"As one of the five 'outstanding and unique areas' mentioned in the Urban Design Plan, Russian Hill is not afforded the existing zoning or height limit protections now given the other four special areas. Nor is the future of Russian Hill clear from a reading of the guidelines.

"For example, a 40' or 88' height limit seems to prevail for the Russian Hill section of the map on page 98, yet is violated by the notion that tall buildings ('point towers') are desirable on the tops of hills ... Russian Hill mentioned in particular.

"How is the 'harmonious, balanced relationship of low, small-scale older buildings and tall, slender towers' to be maintained without a careful survey and specific recommendation for every block of Russian Hill? Until this is available, with neighborhood participation, the financially motivated pressure to build large-scale luxury housing should not be allowed to prevail.

"Please give us time to create a rational, pleasant future for Russian Hill, in accord with the spirit of the brilliant Urban Design Plan which we hope will soon be city policy."

After reading portions of the letter, Mr. Hockaday stated that he believed that the people who had signed the letter had been trying to say that they do not like the proposed building presently under consideration, that they do like the Urban Design Plan, and that they are somewhat confused about the controls which had been proposed for Russian Hill, not understanding the contradiction between proposals for 40 and 88 foot height limits and the statement to the effect that point towers are desirable on the tops of hills. His own proposal was that the height limits on page 93 of the Urban Design Plan should be adopted and that point towers which exceed those height limits should be authorized only as conditional uses in the future.



President Newman read the following statement:

"One factor that the Commission is able to consider in this case is the compliance or non-compliance of the building with the guidelines of the Urban Design Plan published last May. The Commission's review is not based solely upon that Plan, however, for the Urban Design Plan only underscores and makes more evident the established principles to which the community's attention must be addressed in cases such as this one. The building would be good or bad for the city whether or not the Urban Design Plan had been published, and the fact that the Plan has not yet been acted upon by the Commission is not relevant to the issue at hand.

"This building permit application may be considered by City Department's, according to the opinion of the City Attorney, despite the fact that an initiative to limit construction to six stories will appear on the November ballot. Although that initiative may serve to show the degree of citizen concern, the City Attorney had advised, in an opinion issued last April, that applications must continue to be considered."

President Newman then noted that the hour was late and asked the other members of the Commission if they wished to hear more testimony from the audience. The other members of the Commission replied that their preference would be to hear from additional speakers only if they had something new to add to the debate.

Mr. Pengilly stated that his clients would be willing to assume the cost involved if the Commission wished to submit the drawings of the proposed building which had been prepared by both the opponents and proponents to any A.I.A. architect for review and independent analysis as to their accuracy.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he, for one, would like to have the disparity between the drawings clarified because of the magnitude of the disagreement.

Mr. Svirsky asked for an opportunity to clarify some of the issues which had been raised by Mr. Pengilly. While Mr. Pengilly had claimed that the diagonal plan dimension of 1080 Chestnut Street was 184 feet and the combined diagonal plan dimension of 1080 and 1090 Chestnut was 220 feet, his calculation must have been made near the ground at garage level; the actual diagonal plan dimension of the tower of 1080 Chestnut is 117 feet, and the combined dimension is much less than 220 feet. Mr. Pengilly had referred to the report of the Urban Design Committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce in which the Committee had stated its concern about certain aspects of the height and bulk guidelines which had been recommended in the Urban Design Plan; but Mr. Svirsky remarked that it should be noted the Chamber's Committee had not stated that the guidelines were wrong as a judgment as to what is appropriate development for the city. The staff is familiar with the points raised by the Chamber



report; they were discussed a great deal during the course of the Urban Design Study with a committee of the American Institute of Architects and others, but it was not found that these questions affected the Plan's validity. Mr. Pengilly had also claimed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had made a major error regarding placement of the driveways to the building on Chestnut Street; however, the final preference for garage entrances from Lombard Street had been made after consultation with the Division of Traffic Engineering of the Department of Public Works which indicated that automobile access from either street would be acceptable, but that Lombard Street should be preferred because it had only one other driveway in this block. As a further consideration, there was some possibility that the curving portion of Lombard Street in the next block might be closed to traffic. Mr. Pengilly had remarked that the only discrepancy between the proposed building and the urban design terms of reference which had been prepared by the Department of City Planning was its bulk; however, even if that were the case, Mr. Svirsky pointed out that bulk was the most important consideration and was therefore listed first in the design terms of reference. In fact, however, the building failed to meet the design terms of reference in other respects including its height (especially when combined with the bulk), the lack of moderating elements such as townhouses at ground level and the intrusiveness of the garage. Finally, while Mr. Pengilly had stated that the design terms of reference had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning for another project, the fact was that the terms of reference had been prepared for the site and not for any particular project. Actually, the staff had been in contact with up to five prospective developers of the site, each of whom was considering a different development scheme.

Priscilla Hull, a Director of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce, supported the staff of the Department of City Planning and the Russian Hill Improvement Association in opposing the proposed building. She noted that her organization had requested both the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission to enact a moratorium on high-rise construction until controls such as those in the Urban Design Plan can be adopted; and she felt that the Commission should not approve any new major buildings until the electorate has had an opportunity to vote on the Duskin Initiative in November.

Peter Christelman, representing San Francisco Tomorrow, stated that his organization wished to go on record as being opposed to the proposed building; and he indicated that he would be willing to elaborate on the reasons for the opposition if the Commission so desired.

Edward Bielski, representing the Committee for a Vote on High-rise, stated that his organization, also, wished to be placed on record as being in opposition to the proposed building. He also advised the Commission that the suit which his organization had filed against the City to prevent the issuance of any permit for any major building until the electorate has voted on the Duskin Initiative in November would go to court the next day.



Robert Katz, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stated that the proposed building would be bad for Russian Hill, but, would be infinitely worse for the rest of the city than for Russian Hill.

James Robertson called attention to the fact that Lombard Street in front of the subject property is usually characterized by heavy congestion because of automobiles lined up to see the curving portion of Lombard Street to the east, because of sightseeing and City buses parked in the area, and because of the cable car traffic on Hyde Street.

Commissioner Porter moved that the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff be adopted and that the subject building permit application be disapproved. While there had been considerable discussion of the Commission's authority to undertake a discretionary review of the subject permit application, she emphasized that the Commission does have a prerogative to deviate from established codes and ordinances to review other factors of any building permit application which might be filed. Furthermore, she noted that even after the Urban Design Plan is adopted, buildings may conceivably be proposed in conformance with those policies and principles which would still be blot on the neighborhood involved and a blight on the city as a whole; and she indicated that the Commission would continue to preserve its right to conduct discretionary reviews of all building applications in the future including those which might conform both to the Zoning Ordinance and to the guidelines contained in the Urban Design Plan.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that two brochures had been submitted to the Commission and that two separate sets of photographs had been displayed; and he indicated that his own decision on the permit application had not been governed by either set of photographs. He was opposed to construction of the proposed building because he believed it might create conflict and disturb the environment of Russian Hill. He was also concerned about the effect which blasting on the site might have on the nearby reservoirs. Furthermore, he remarked that elements of the final design of the proposed building were not clear, noted that an initiative is pending to prohibit the City from issuing permits for buildings over six stories in height, and pointed out that the Urban Design Plan which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning is still pending approval by the Commission. He commented on the fact that the property presently under consideration is one of the major remaining unimproved sites on Russian Hill and that it contains a wooded area which was originally the garden of the William Shafter home; and he pointed out that the plans which had been prepared by the applicants could create a number of problems in the area. He remarked that the subject property will be a difficult site to develop, as evidenced by the fact that prior development schemes which had been proposed by different individuals for the site had not succeeded. Given the large size of the site, he felt that it was obvious that it cannot be developed in an insensitive way. For these reasons, he wished to second the motion which had been made by Commissioner Porter. In conclusion, he stated that he believed that the applicants had acted in good faith and that they had



not tried to sneak something over on the community as had been suggested by one of the speakers; however, he felt that the building which was being proposed would be too large for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Rueda remarked that he did not feel that the floor area ratio standards of the City Planning Code were intended to encourage people to construct the largest buildings possible on sites as large as this one.

When the question was called, the Commissioner voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff as City Planning, Resolution No. 6743, and to disapprove Building Application No. 398946.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 19, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 19, 1971, at 1:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning); Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; James Paul, Planner III; James White, Planner II; Emily Hill, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

1:00 P.M. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on September 2, 1971, and to property on Upper Terrace east of Monument Way which was the subject of Referral 71.34 which was considered later in the afternoon.

2:15 P.M. 100 Larkin Street

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reminded the Composite Waterfront Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Fleishhacker, Porter, Ritchie) of a meeting scheduled on Monday, August 23, at 2:00 p.m.

The Director asked the Chairman of the Area Plans & Studies Committee (Commissioner Porter), the Chairman of the Plan Implementation Committee (Commissioner Fleishhacker), and the Chairman of the City Wide Comprehensive Plans Committee (Commissioner Newman) to meet on Tuesday, August 24, at 3:30 p.m.

The Director reminded the Plan Implementation Committee (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Porter) of a meeting on Wednesday, August 25, at 3:30 p.m. to review the September 2 Zoning Cases.



The Director informed the Commission that he had attended a neighborhood meeting on the previous evening for a discussion of the proposed expansion of the Pacific Medical Center.

The Director advised the Commission that the Automobile Dismantlers had withdrawn from the Board of Supervisors their appeal of the Commission's disapproval of their Conditional Use Application in the South Bayshore Area.

The Director distributed two brochures on the FACE program which had been prepared jointly by the Department of City Planning and the Department of Public Works.

The Director informed the Commission that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board will hold a public hearing on September 22 to consider the proposal to designate Jackson Square as an historic district.

The Director advised the Commission that Supervisor Pelosi has introduced a resolution which will be considered by the Streets and Transportation Committee of the Board calling upon the Department of City Planning, in cooperation with the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Public Works, to undertake studies and to hold public hearings for the purpose of recommending City policy with respect to transportation and design aspects of the Sunset Boulevard corridor, with a report of such findings and recommendations to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors on or before March 1, 1972. The Director stated that he will meet with Mr. Crowley and Mr. Tatarian on September 17th to discuss departmental responsibilities regarding this matter, assuming that the Board adopts Supervisor Pelosi's resolution.

The Director indicated that he wished to report on comments which had been received from the public regarding the Urban Design Plan after the other items on the Commission's agenda had been considered.

President Newman remarked that individual members of the Commission had received letters from the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council requesting that a 40-foot height limit be established for the neighborhood bounded by Arguello Street on the west, Fulton Street on the north, Divisadero and Castro Streets on the east, and, on the south, 17th Street west to Clayton, south on Clayton to Carmel, west on Carmel to the point beyond Shrader at which Carmel and Arguello would intersect if both were extended. He asked for the Director's comments on that request. The Director replied that no action should be taken on the request until the Urban Design Plan is adopted as a part of the Master Plan. In the meantime, the staff of the Department of City Planning would review the request which had been made by the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council.

R71.34 - Vacation of a portion of Upper Terrace east of Monument Way  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of August 12, 1971)



August 19, 1971

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, stated that this matter had been taken under advisement from the Meeting of August 12 in order to give the Commission an opportunity to take a field trip to the site; and he indicated that the field trip had been made earlier in the afternoon.

The Director repeated the recommendation which had been made previously for approval of the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Upper Terrace as in conformity with the Master Plan on the condition that the owners of Lots 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42, Block 2628, grant the City the vehicular right to these lots from 17th Street.

Thomas McCormick, one of the applicants, indicated that he had nothing further to add to comments which he had made last week.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the proposed street vacation.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that properties on the opposite side of Upper Terrace are developed with small houses which presently enjoy views over the vacant lots on the south side of the street, asked how tall the buildings to be constructed on the vacant lots might be. Mr. McCormick indicated that he could not speak for the other property owners involved; however, since the zoning of the properties would allow construction of only two dwelling units on each lot, he doubted that the buildings would have a height much greater than 28 feet above Upper Terrace. It was also conceivable that the buildings might be constructed below grade. As for his own property, he expected that he would construct a two-story building above a garage which would have a height in the range of 26 and 28 feet above Upper Terrace.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the people living across the street may have been under the impression that the vacant lots could not be developed or that the development would be limited to the lower portions of the lots; however, if the street vacation request were to be approved, buildings could be constructed on the upper portions of the lots which might interfere with views presently enjoyed from houses located across the street.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the Commission could affix conditions to its approval of the street vacation request. Mr. Steele replied in the negative but indicated that conditions could be recommended to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. McCormick stated that views are lost every day of the week; and he advised the Commission that he had owned a piece of property which had enjoyed an attractive view until the view was blocked out by construction of a new building on the other side of the street. If the people owning property on the north side of Upper Terrace had been concerned about preservation of their views, he believed that they would have endeavored to purchase the vacant lots on the south side of the street.



August 19, 1971

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the property owners on the other side of the street had probably assumed that any development of the vacant lots would probably take place on 17th Street rather than on Upper Terrace.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the property owners on the other side of Upper Terrace had been notified that the proposed street vacation would be considered by the City Planning Commission. Mr. Jung replied in the negative, indicating that the Department of City Planning is not required to hold public hearings on referral matters.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the owners of property on the north side of the street should be apprised of the fact that a request for vacation of a portion of the street is pending; and, therefore, he moved that the matter be continued under advisement for one additional week so that notification of the proposal could be given to property owners on the other side of the street. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried unanimously.

R71.36 - Vacation of Dixie Alley between Market Street and Grand View Avenue

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Dixie Alley is a 10-foot wide easement extending approximately 135 feet from upper Market Street down to Grand View Avenue, and is improved with a wooden stairway for most of its length and with a short section of concrete stairway at the lower end. Three properties adjoin Dixie Alley: a five-unit building on the south and two single-family dwellings on the north. They all have at least one window and secondary entrances on the alley.

"An inquiry from one of the abutting owners several months ago about his liability for injuries on the wooden stairway led to a proposal by the Department of Public Works to build a concrete stairway for the entire length of the alley under assessment proceedings. The total cost of the new concrete stairway was estimated at \$19,500, including \$3,000 for lighting out of City funds, and \$1,500 for advertising, engineering and inspection costs. City aid from gas taxes would pay for the portion not covered by the assessment proceedings.

"The proposed assessment district included the 5-unit property on the south, the two single-family units on the north, and seven other properties to the north going downhill along Market Street. The proposed assessments ranged from \$2400 down to \$116, and totaled \$8124. The Department of Public Works held an informal public meeting on June 9 at which all of the potential assessees except one protested, whereupon a staff member from the Department of Public Works suggested that Dixie Alley be vacated. The three abutting owners on Dixie Alley subsequently petitioned for its vacation. If it is vacated, they could install gates to keep out the public.



"There is no public transportation on upper Market Street, and the street system is such that there are very few places where pedestrians can cross and get to the streets above or below where there are bus lines. Along this section of upper Market Street, there are only three ways down to the Eureka Valley area. One is the overpass at 23rd Street which is designed so that its spiral ramp gives access to both Market Street and Grand View Avenue. Then there is Dixie Alley, about 500 feet downhill to the north, touching Grand View at Alvarado Street. Morgan Alley, another pedestrian way farther down, is not improved at all and is not usable at present. Romain Street is about 1100 feet down from Dixie Alley, but because of the discontinuous street pattern is not very convenient.

"The No. 11 (Hoffman) bus provides service from Eureka Valley to downtown via Mission Street. For several blocks it runs along Hoffman Street, one block below Grand View Avenue, and then for one block along Grand View. The Dixie Alley pedestrian way is a convenient route to reach this bus line from upper Market Street, and this is its most obvious public use. Other pedestrian uses may include getting to church, to local shopping on 24th Street, to Alvarado School (regardless of the future of school busing, some children will be attending neighborhood schools and others will be walking to meet their buses), or simply recreational walking.

"On a July weekday in 1971, a Department of Public Works pedestrian count made between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. showed 17 pedestrians using the stairway.

"Objections to a new stairway by those included in the assessment district seem to be based on being asked to contribute financially to a facility they might not use personally. Two things might be done to reduce the financial burden on these owners. One, the assessment district might be redrawn to spread the cost a little more widely, and the maximum amount of City aid should be given. Two, the cost could be reduced by using wood construction, at \$10 a square foot instead of \$25 a square foot for concrete."

During the course of the presentation, Commissioner Porter arrived in the meeting room and assumed her seat at the Commission table.

The Director remarked that the City's maintenance cost would be higher with a wooden stairway; but, because wood has resilience, it would be easier on the human frame. He also pointed out that a precedent had been established for wooden stairways by the new wood stairway which will be constructed on Filbert Street on Telegraph Hill. He recommended that the vacation of Dixie Alley between Market Street and Grand View Avenue be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan because it is necessary for the convenience of pedestrians. He further recommended that the Department of Public Works seek ways of reducing the cost of a new stairway and of reducing the amounts assessed against individual property owners.



August 19, 1971

Elsa Strait, Secretary of the Grand View Neighbors, stated that she had used the stairs on Dixie Alley since 1941; and she indicated that the wooden stairs had lasted beautifully for at least 20 years or until the new apartment house had been constructed at the foot of the street. Even the remaining wooden portion of the stairs has been well maintained. She stated that one of the "single family dwellings" which abuts Dixie Alley has a second entrance with an address listed as 10 Dixie Alley. In terms of ecology, she felt that it would be bad for the city to give up any additional open space. And, since she felt that use of transit should be encouraged, she believed that Dixie Alley should remain within the public domain for the convenience of individuals living on Market Street who make use of the public transportation available lower on the hill.

Ralph B. Palmer, 3757 Market Street, stated that his wife does not drive an automobile; and, since both Romain Street and 23rd Street are too far away for her to walk to make a connection with public transportation, he urged that Dixie Alley not be vacated.

The Secretary stated that he had received a letter from David Leash, President of the Eureka Valley Promotion Association, in opposition to the proposed vacation of Dixie Alley. Letters had also been received from Mrs. Strait and from Mr. and Mrs. Palmer.

Mrs. Strait, noting that the pedestrian count which had been made by the Department of Public Works had been taken between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on a day when school was not in session, remarked that a greater number of people could be expected to use the stairs earlier in the morning on school days.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that three members of the Commission had made a field trip to Dixie Alley earlier in the afternoon and had all been of the opinion that the street should not be abandoned. While the existing stairway may be in need of some repairs, he questioned whether an expenditure of \$20,000 would be necessary.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the vacation request be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the wooden stairway has a certain character which would be lost if the steps were to be reconstructed in concrete. Therefore, he felt that the stairs should be reconstructed in wood.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Director to report that the vacation of Dixie Alley between Market Street and Grand View Avenue is in conflict with the Master Plan because it is necessary for the convenience of pedestrians. It was further recommended that the Department of Public Works seek ways of reducing the cost of a new stairway and of reducing the amounts assessed against individual property owners.



Consideration of Final Staff Recommendations on Recreation Sites in the Central Waterfront Area

(Postponed from Meeting of August 12, 1971)

The Director noted that a Committee of the Commission is scheduled to meet next Monday to discuss this matter; and, therefore, he recommended that consideration by the full Commission be postponed until the meeting of September 2, 1971.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that consideration of this matter be postponed until the meeting of September 2, 1971.

Progress Report on Chinatown 701 Study

Paul Sedway and Thomas Cooke, Consultants for the 701 Housing and Recreation Study of Chinatown, submitted and summarized a report on their major findings to date, their proposed program recommendations, and their recommendations for immediate action. The report, dated August 19, 1971, is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the Consultants had identified 39 sites as potential locations for housing, asked if the sites are in the center or on the peripheries of the study area. Mr. Cooke replied that 50% or more of the sites are located on the perimeters of the study area.

Commissioner Porter then asked if any of the 39 sites are presently Chinese-owned. She noted that ownership by large Chinese Family Organizations often renders acquisition of properties extremely difficult. Mr. Cooke replied that the consultants had wanted to interest Chinese Family Associations in rehabilitating their properties; however, nothing could be done until relocation housing can be provided for people presently living in those buildings. Therefore, rehabilitation of the Family-owned buildings in the core of Chinatown could not be undertaken during the first two phases of the housing program. During those two phases, emphasis would be placed on the construction of new housing around the perimeters of the area.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the low cost housing which had been proposed in the report would be exclusively for Chinese people. Mr. Cooke replied that the low and moderate housing proposed in the report would not be solely for Chinese people; however, given the need for additional housing in Chinatown, he assumed that a significant percentage of the residents of the new housing projects would be Chinese.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the consultants had recommended that housing be constructed on the Kirkland Bus Yards site at Powell and Northpoint Streets, stated that he disagreed with the estimate of the value of that property as stated on page 12 of the report. The report read as follows: "The site..... has no assessed value. However, the scavenger truck storage yard, adjacent to the Kirkland Bus Yards on its western side, has a land value of \$1,365,000 and an improvement value of \$650,000 with similar characteristics as the bus yards,



except that it is in a C-2 zoning district. This suggests that the land value of the bus yard site is less than the scavenger site." Commissioner Ritchie remarked that a total value of \$1,355,000 would mean that the land is worth only \$10 or \$12 a square foot; and, since he believed that the property is actually worth \$20 to \$25 a square foot, he felt that the total site would actually have a value of approximately \$3 million. He also remarked that the Kirkland Bus Yardssite is located closer to the Fisherman's Wharf Commercial Area than to Chinatown; and he questioned whether use of the site for a Chinese housing project would be appropriate.

Mr. Cooke stated that the Kirkland Bus Yards is one of the sites on the perimeter of Chinatown which might be developed with housing to be used as a relocation resource. While the property may not technically fall within the boundaries of the study area, it is close enough to Chinatown to be of use in solving Chinatown's housing problems. With regard to the value of the property, he indicated that Commissioner Ritchie's figures could be correct.

Commissioner Ritchie pointed out that the consultants had also suggested, on page 13 of the report, that the Board of Supervisors might wish to consider writing down the cost of acquiring the Kirkland Bus Yards site to meet HUD statutory mortgage limits; and he remarked that such an action would further reduce the City's income from sale of the property.

Commissioner Mellon stated that zoning of the Kirkland Bus Yards site had at one time been under consideration by the Commission; and he had taken the position that the property should be zoned commercial rather than residential to protect the city's economic interest in the property. Later, he had recognized that a high priority must be given to housing and had reversed his position on the zoning of the property.

Commissioner Finn stated that Mr. Carr, who was then Director of the Public Utilities Commission, had agreed to residential zoning for the site. He emphasized however, that the site is not presently available for other uses and that it will not be available until another suitable site can be found for the bus yard; and he indicated that an alternate site could not be acquired unless the property on Northpoint Street can be sold at a price close to its fair market value.

Commissioner Porter pointed out that the Commission had already reduced the value of the property by rezoning it for residential use; yet, while that action had been taken because of the City's housing needs, the Commission had not made a recommendation concerning the type of housing which would be appropriate on the site.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that many of the housing and recreation goals and objectives stated in the report which had been submitted by the consultants would require special funding by the City, State and Federal Governments; and the extent to which the City would be willing to contribute, by writing down the cost of the Kirkland Bus Yards site, for instance, would have to be determined at the legislative level.



August 19, 1971

Mr. Cooke emphasized that while the Kirkland Bus Yards site might be located outside of the perimeters of the study area, construction of two-hundred and fifty relocation units on that property would enable the rehabilitation of seven to ten sites in Chinatown itself.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that public housing on the Kirkland Bus Yards site might be attractive to many people; and he questioned whether it would be possible to give priority to such housing to Chinese people.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was not opposed to low-cost housing; however, he did not feel that the City should go out of its way to deflate the value of its own property for the benefit of private developers. He suggested that a more appropriate alternative would be to sell the Kirkland Bus Yards site at its full cash value and to use some of the money obtained to fund a better housing project on another site in a less prime location.

The Director stated that one of the purposes of the progress report which had been prepared by the consultants was to impress upon the Commission and, through the Commission, the public at large, the extremely critical housing and open space problems which are presently being faced in Chinatown; and, in that regard, he had prepared a draft resolution for consideration by the Commission. The draft resolution contained the following resolve: "Now, therefore be it resolved, that the City Planning Commission recommends Chinatown as a priority area for local and Federal assistance, and authorizes the Director of Planning to transmit the Interim Status Report to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to inform officials on study progress and on the need for further public assistance in carrying out anticipated improvement projects in Chinatown".

Commissioner Porter asked if the Chinatown Citizen's Advisory Committee had approved the interim report in principle. The Director replied that the major study findings, as indicated on pages 4 through 6 of the report, are merely statements of fact and are well recognized in Chinatown; recommendations for specific projects, however, had been reviewed and approved in principle by the Citizens Advisory Committee. He emphasized, however, that adoption of the draft resolution would not constitute an approval of the programs proposed; it would merely authorize transmittal of the report to the Board of Supervisors and to HUD.

Commissioner Mellon suggested that the wording of the draft resolution's resolve should be changed to read as follows: "Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the City Planning Commission recommends Chinatown as one of the priority areas for local and Federal assistance, .....".

The Director agreed to the change.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the comments on page 12 of the report relating to the value of the Kirkland Bus Yards should be deleted if the report is to be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors.



The Director and the consultants indicated that they would be willing to delete those comments from the report.

A member of the audience stated that he had understood that only two or three Chinese were on the committee which had reviewed the consultants report; and he felt that the report should have been reviewed by the Chinese American Alliance and the Six Companies. The Director replied that both of the organizations which had been mentioned are represented on the Citizen's Advisory Committee; and he indicated that an overwhelming number of the members of the Committee are Chinese.

Michael Fischer, Assistant Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association and a member of the Chinatown Citizen's Advisory Committee, confirmed that almost all of the recommendations contained in the consultant's report had been reviewed and approved by the Citizen's Advisory Committee.

Truman Wong, a one time resident of the core area of Chinatown, felt that the statistics which were contained in the report understated the seriousness of the problems being faced in Chinatown; and he suggested that the magnitude of the problem might be better illustrated by the fact that it is not unusual for as many as nine people to be living together in a single room only 1/4 the size of the Commission's meeting room, sharing kitchens and bathrooms, in the core area of Chinatown.

Commissioner Fleishhacker pointed out that page 4 of the report contained the following statement: "The housing and recreation problems of Chinatown are clearly among the most serious in the Bay Area."

The Director stated that one of the purposes of adopting the draft resolution which he had prepared would be to inform the Board of Supervisors and the Community at large of the seriousness of the problems being faced in Chinatown.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, as modified, be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6744.

#### CURRENT MATTERS, CONTINUED

The Director distributed a 25-page memorandum which he had prepared as an analysis of the comments received from the public regarding the Urban Design Plan and read from the first four pages of the memorandum as follows:

"The Urban Design Plan will again be before the Planning Commission for consideration on August 26, when it will be proposed for adoption as part of the City's Master Plan. The matter was taken under advisement after a public hearing that began on July 8 and was continued on July 14 and 21.



"Beginning with the first presentation of the finished version of the Plan on May 20, more than 3,000 people have attended presentations of the Plan, and many others have followed the press coverage and seen the panel exhibit placed in libraries and at other public places. Seventy-two people and organizations have taken the time to provide the Commission and Department with written comments, and 44 have spoken at the hearings; many other citizens have discussed the plan with members of the staff. With perhaps only one exception, the indication has been that the period provided for public comments has been adequate.

"General Nature of the Comments

"For the most part, those who commented were familiar with the fact that the Urban Design Plan was produced after more than two years of work and not as a reaction to current issues alone. As our presentations have stressed, the Plan is intended as a lasting framework for rational decision making and community agreement. Yet there was an understandable tendency in many of the comments to focus upon immediate concerns and issues. .

"Some comments found difficulty in the fact that the Urban Design Plan is only one element in the series of elements that will make up the total Master Plan. It was felt that comprehensive planning requires many social and economic inputs, and special attention was called to issues in housing and transportation. These comments underscore the need to proceed in a deliberate way with the drawing up of further elements of the Master Plan and with implementation of those that are adopted.

"The preponderance of public statements on the Urban Design Plan was in favor of the Plan, either as drafted or with certain changes to strengthen it. However, the comments tended to be in terms of greater or less flexibility rather than outright weakening or strengthening. Where there was any disagreement in this regard, it usually had to do with the degree of specificity and detail in the Plan, and at times the degree called for went beyond the scope of a policy plan of this kind. In a number of cases, as outlined in this memorandum, the staff recommends' clarification by changes in the language of the Plan.

"On the whole, the period of public consideration of this Plan must be judged to have been highly productive. It has shown the depth of concern with the issues addressed in the Plan, and has helped to refine the document. The responses in this memorandum concentrate upon pages 13 through 132 of the Plan report, which constitute the Master Plan element. Where comments seemed to overlook policies already in the Plan, or raised minor questions of emphasis, the responses are brief. More important substantive questions are dealt



with at greater length. In addition, there are two pervading concerns that call for some further words in this introduction.

"Concern About Growth"

"The portion of the Plan on Major New Development received more comments, both in number and in length, than any other portion of the Plan. Although this tended to draw attention unduly from the other three portions, it did show a depth of concern already made apparent in other ways in recent years.

"There were a few statements to the effect that this is a growth plan, that it contemplates and favors a rapid increase in development, especially in commercial areas of the city. Other statements took a different view, reading the emphasis of the Plan on conservation and on moderation of new development as a bias that might favor freezing the existing city and reducing the opportunity for growth. These are different points of view, and yet there was, in all the comments, a surprising near-agreement against 'Manhattanization' and against the long-term overbuilding of downtown, the neighborhoods and the waterfront. There was a desire to have the density and total amount of growth quantified, as a kind of positive statement about the city's future rather than a negative policy of restriction. If the comments on the Urban Design Plan reflect the views of the community at large -- and there is reason to believe that they do -- then there is probably more agreement on questions of growth in 1971 than there has been in past years. Certainly the concept of limited growth has been increasingly prominent.

"What does the Plan say about growth? Some of those who have written and testified have said the Plan assumes growth is desirable; others have felt it assumes growth is undesirable. More often than not, these statements reflected a predisposition on the part of the speaker.

"The Plan report shows considerable concern as to growth (especially at pages 2, 6, 7 and 75), and Policy 9 under Major New Development states that 'there is nothing in the nature of cities that will guarantee the continued livability of this or any other city', noting that 'the advantages of greater size and intensity may have ultimate limits.' It is true, however, that the Plan is addressed less to the question of overall growth than to the effects of change. That is the nature of an urban design document of this kind: it must be prepared to deal with the problems of change in the city, whether or not there is growth, and whatever the speed and degree of growth. This is an important distinction.



"Much more is needed on the subject of growth, and the implementation portion of the Plan report, at page 149, calls for 'study and education as to the long-term effects of continued growth in a finite urban environment.' It is to be hoped that San Francisco, with its deep and widespread concern for the quality of its environment, and its unequalled past record in introducing innovative development controls, can approach and solve the question of growth in a rational manner.

"It is hard to imagine a more difficult question, however. There are economic, social and environmental factors that defy any effort at quantification and balancing. There are regional and national trends and policies that are closely tied to local development. There are, furthermore, many possible consequences of new limits on growth that the San Francisco community may not be willing to accept.

"Closely related to the comments on growth have been the comments on traffic and transportation. Increased traffic has been seen as an inevitable consequence of growth. Although traffic is an important subject of the Urban Design Plan, the means for controlling the total amount of traffic and for improving the position of public transit are described in policies of the Improvement Plan for Transportation, soon to be placed before the Planning Commission. As this and further elements of the Master Plan are completed, public policies as to total growth of the city will surely evolve. With those policies more fully developed, it is possible that the Urban Design Plan should later be revised to reflect them. It is anticipated, indeed, that the Urban Design Plan will be periodically reviewed and revised as the need arises and as other Master Plan policies become more explicit.

#### "Concern About Implementation

"Many of the comments, while discussing the policies in the Plan, touched mainly upon matters of implementation. These comments, in effect, said that the policies were correct, but asked that they be quickly carried out, often questioning whether the follow-through would actually occur.

"This memorandum will not attempt to answer all the questions of this kind, and it has often been stated that the first order of business is to complete and act upon the Plan itself. It is also apparent that publicity for the Plan and public understanding of it are essential to give the Plan meaning and to see that it is carried out -- after all, the Plan is intended to be addressed to everyone in the community.

"It should not be necessary to state here that the Department and the Commission have been sincere in their intention to produce an Urban Design Plan that will have meaning and that will be followed through. But these intentions alone will not be adequate without community



support and without the wherewithal for planning, including funds. Most of those who have written and testified have appreciated these facts. The carrying out of policies as broad as those in this Plan is a long-term thing, and a complete timetable and detailed program for implementation would be difficult to draw up and even more difficult to carry out. It is, however, quite possible to base shorter-term programs and priorities upon the Plan, and to measure current decisions against the policies of the Plan.

"A suggestion was made, as it has been from time to time as work has progressed on elements of the Master Plan, that this Urban Design Plan would be more effective as public policy if it were adopted by the Board of Supervisors as well as by the Planning Commission. The same question was raised when Charter reform was proposed two years ago. It has been the Department's response that this approach contemplates a different type of Master Plan and a somewhat different form of government. If a new approach is called for, submission of the Urban Design Plan to the Board would not appear to be the place to start. As in the past, however, this Plan contemplates that specific policies will be submitted to the Board, in the form of legislation and programs to carry out the Plan.

"Other comments made it quite clear that many people in the community want to have a say in review of large development projects having a city-wide effect, and in developments of any kind that affect their neighborhoods. There is ample language in the Plan report to show that this interest is understood and respected, and the Plan calls for increased citizen involvement. Whether this involvement should include design review boards is a question of implementation that will undoubtedly be further discussed as time goes on. The Department has usually avoided use of the term 'design review' because this term means different things to different people. The Plan report expresses a preference for extending existing review procedures and making them more responsive.

"Several organizations and individuals have expressed a desire for a moratorium or interim control of development pursuant to the Urban Design Plan, especially as to the height and bulk of new buildings. It is possible that, in view of the present haste of some developers to get buildings underway, the Plan's guidelines will be seriously violated before permanent legislation can be prepared and adopted. While the Plan report places emphasis upon adoption of the Plan itself and calls for an orderly process of implementation, it would be possible for interim control of height and bulk to be instituted through a resolution of the Planning Commission as requested by those who have spoken and written on this question."

The Director then requested that the following list of individuals and organizations which had submitted letters on the Urban Design Plan since the previously recorded listing on July 21, 1971, be included in the minutes of the meeting:



Neighborhood and Civic Organizations

Outer Richmond Neighborhood Association (Mrs. R. H. LaRue)

San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association  
(Michael L. Fischer)

San Francisco Tomorrow (Anthony P. Kilroy)

Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce (Lawrence Lackey)

California Roadside Council (Mrs. Ralph A. Reynolds)

Potrero Hill Residents and Homeowners Council (Anna Buck)

Telegraph Hill Dwellers (Robert Katz)

Downtown Association of San Francisco (Newsletter)

Business and Professional

Gilman B. Haynes, Jr. (Wells Fargo Bank)

Aaron G. Green, F.A.I.A.

George S. Miller (National Associates, Inc.)

John O. Merrill (Skidmore, Owings & Merrill)

Edward C. Bassett " " "

John R. Weese " " "

Walter H. Costa " " "

Marc Goldstein " " "

Concerned Citizens

Christina M. Groth

Mrs. Millie McK. Whiteside

Walter A. Susor

Rita S. Hockaday

The Director then summarized pages 5 - 25 of the memorandum which had been distributed to members of the Commission, as follows:

"In the body of the memorandum you are receiving today, the staff is recommending twelve changes in the text of the Urban Design Plan, and changes in three of the maps.

"As you will see, the text changes are all rather small, but nevertheless they are significant to the total plan. These changes concern such things as building facade lines, defining neighborhood centers, signs, the color of lighting for major roadways, and the location of traffic-generating commercial buildings.

"One of the more significant changes is a clarification of the policy concerning tall buildings on the tops of hills, making it even more clear that this policy does not apply to all hills in the city.



"There was a lot of interest in the criteria for street vacations, and a change recommended for that part of the Plan would note that vacations should not be permitted if they would result in excessive density of workers or a building of excessive height and bulk.

"Finally, changes are recommended for the maps on height guidelines, bulk guidelines, and protected residential areas.

"Concerning the guidelines for height, there are 20 changes listed. These have varying degrees of importance. In order to make the Commission's review easier, prior to next week's meeting, we will deliver to the members next Monday a fresh copy of the Urban Design Plan with these height guideline's changes indicated on an overlay in the book.

"As the memorandum points out, the bulk guidelines map has been completely redrawn so that it will be consistent with the height guidelines map. This does not change the basic substance of the bulk map, but it makes the map much easier to use. The new bulk map is here before you, together with the old one.

"Changes in the protected residential areas map, if they are to be made, should occur at a later time when the Improvement Plan for Transportation is before the Commission. As the memorandum states, this map should agree with the Transportation Plan maps as to how the street system will work relative to the residential neighborhoods."

Commissioner Porter asked if any changes were being proposed in the plan which would satisfy the objections which had been raised by the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council regarding the building height proposed along the Panhandle. The Director replied that significant changes had been made in the heights being proposed along the Panhandle and in the vicinity of the University of California Medical Center.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was disturbed by the fact that the Russian Hill apartment building which had been the subject of a discretionary review conducted by the Commission during its hearing on August 12 might still have had a disruptive influence on the surrounding neighborhood even if it had conformed to the general guidelines stated in the Urban Design Plan; and she wondered if it would not have been desirable for the Urban Design Plan to obtain more sensitive guidelines for the City's more sensitive neighborhoods. The Director replied that even the most detailed guidelines and follow-up legislation could not insure design acceptability in every single case which might arise. However, he felt that it would be important to make every effort to pursue effectuation measures which would give added strength to the guidelines which had been proposed in the Urban Design Plan. In that regard, he felt that it would be essential to establish procedures whereby developers of specific sites would be encouraged to contact the Commission at an early date so that urban design guidelines for their projects could be prepared and so that procedures could be established to direct the development of plans before applications are made for



August 19, 1971

building permits. One of the letters which had been received from the public had suggested that the staff of the Department of City Planning should prepare urban design terms of reference for all large sites which might be subject to development in the foreseeable future; however, even if the Department of City Planning had a sufficiently large staff to undertake such a project, ownership patterns would still be subject to change and proposals would inevitably arise which would not have been anticipated.

Commissioner Porter remarked that never before in her experience as a City Planning Commissioner had proposals as significant as those which were contained in the Urban Design Plan received so few objections at public hearings; however, since at least four architects had raised questions to her personally regarding the guidelines for building bulk which were contained in the plan, she wondered if the staff of the Department of City Planning would be prepared to explain how it had arrived at the specific dimensions which had been recommended. The Director indicated that the method which had been used to arrive at the figures had been explained in Preliminary Report No. 8. The staff had taken note of the existing height in each area of the City and had then worked with the Citizen's Advisory Committee, a special subcommittee of the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and with individual architects to arrive at the dimensions which had been proposed. Some of the individuals who had been consulted had felt that the dimensions which had finally been proposed were too lenient.

President Newman asked how establishment of interim height and bulk controls might be used to effect implementation of the Urban Design Plan. The Director replied that establishment of interim height and bulk controls would constitute a major step towards implementation of the plan. If the Commission so desired, it could announce its intention to consider zoning reclassification of property based on the height and bulk guidelines of the plan; and, until such time as final action was taken on the reclassification, all new construction would be subject both to existing zoning standards and to the controls under consideration.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Commission could announce its intention of considering such legislation at the present time. The Director replied in the affirmative but suggested that it would be preferable to wait until the Urban Design Plan had been adopted as a part of the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the proposed height and bulk controls might not take every conceivable situation into account, felt that it would be important for the Commission to maintain its right of discretionary review over all building permit applications even if the course of action which had been outlined by the Director were to be followed. The Director replied that the Commission always retains its right to conduct a discretionary review of any building permit application which might be filed.

President Newman inquired about the circumstances which might develop if the Commission were to adopt the Urban Design Plan as a part of the Master Plan



without adopting a resolution announcing its intention to consider specific legislation for height and bulk controls. The Director replied that the Commission would then have no power other than its discretionary review authority to prevent the construction of buildings which would be in conflict with the guidelines contained in the plan; and, as a result, changes could occur which would render the plan obsolete.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that in the interim a delay in acting would encourage a rush of applications for ill-considered buildings; and, therefore, he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should prepare a draft resolution for possible consideration by the Commission at its meeting on August 26 which would announce the Commission's intention to consider reclassification for height and bulk controls.

Commissioner Porter asked if appeals from actions of the Department of City Planning denying permits which failed to meet the height and bulk standards of the proposed legislation would be made to the Board of Supervisors or to the Board of Permit Appeals. The Director replied that no appeals would be permitted where fixed limits were set, but that if flexibility were provided for in the interim and the Commission exercised discretion, then the appeal would be to the Board of Permit Appeals within the range of discretion provided for.

After further discussion, Commissioner Fleishhacker again requested that the staff of the Department of City Planning prepare a draft resolution to announce the Commission's intention to reclassify for height and bulk controls for possible consideration during the Commission's next meeting on August 26.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 26, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 26, 1971, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Richard Hedman, Planner V - Urban Design; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Ralph Mead, Planner IV - Zoning; James White, Planner II; William Duchek, Planner II; Ronald Jonash, Planner II; Emily Hill, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Scott Blakey represented television station KQED.

## CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Chinatown Citizen's Advisory Committee would hold a meeting that evening.

The Director informed the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Monday, had approved on second reading Landmark designations for the Dennis T. Sullivan Memorial Fire Chief's Home, the Cable Car Barn and Power House, and the Donaldina Cameron House. The Board has also passed on second reading a reclassification of property at 1540 Newhall Street from R-1 to R-2.

President Newman informed the Commission that communications had been received from the Charge d'Affairs of the United Arab Republic in Washington D.C., from the Pacific Heights Improvement Association, and from the Cow Hollow Improvement Club requesting the Commission to take action against an allegedly illegal occupancy of a building located at 3001 Pacific Avenue which is owned by the United Arab Republic. R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning had made an investigation of the use of the building at 3001 Pacific Avenue and had determined that the use appeared to conform to the single family provisions of the City Planning Code as interpreted by the Zoning Administrator. Subsequently, he had met personally with John Maher of the Delancy Street Foundation, Inc. to discuss that organization's use of the building; and he had later sent a letter to Mr. Maher which read, in part, as follows:



AUGUST 26, 1971

"It is our understanding that you intend to comply with the Planning Code by limiting the number of persons who will occupy the property to a married couple and not more than 5 other unrelated persons, including yourself, who will live together as a family. There will be no use made of the property other than the residential use stated above.

"Since this letter will constitute a record of our discussion and may be relied upon in subsequent reviews of the property, it is important that you respond immediately if this understanding is uncorrect. If the statements above are correct, it is not necessary to respond."

Since no further response had been received from Mr. Maher, Mr. Steele assumed that the statements contained in the letter had been accepted as correct. Except for the communications which President Newman had just called to the attention of the Commission, no further indication had been received by the staff of the Department of City Planning that the use is in violation of the City Planning Code. Mr. Steele stated that the present definition of single family uses as ones which are limited to a family plus no more than 5 unrelated individuals had been based on the Zoning Administrator's interpretation of the provisions of the City Planning Code; and he noted that an amendment to the City Planning Code which had been approved by the City Planning Commission in 1968 and which would have defined a single family use as one limited to a family plus no more than three unrelated persons had never been acted upon by the Board of Supervisors. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would continue to monitor the use of the building; and, if a violation should be discovered, action will be taken immediately.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Fleishhacker arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the commission table.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the telegram from the Charge d'Affairs of the United Arab Republic had expressed concern about the possibility that the property at 3001 Pacific Avenue might lose its tax exemption if the present use continues, asked if the use would qualify for tax exempt status. Mr. Steele replied that the taxable status of the use would have to be determined by the assessor.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the commission table.

Peter Fay, President of the Pacific Heights Improvement Association, pointed out that almost all of the subject neighborhood is zoned either R-1 or R-1-D; and he indicated that his association, as well as others in the area, was of the opinion that the clear intent of the City Planning Code is to define a "single family" as a group of related individuals. He stated that an accord had been signed in Geneva in 1970 by which all consular buildings



would be exempt from taxes; and he noted that San Francisco already has 62 consulates, some of which occupy more than one building. He stated that the present occupants of 3001 Pacific Avenue have no leasehold on the building; and the United Arab Republic had indicated that it would never give a lease to the present occupants. Therefore, the present occupants are trespassers; and it was hoped that the City Planning Commission could provide assistance in evicting them from the building, particularly since it seemed that the use would constitute a violation of the City Planning Code. Mr. Fay stated that he did not object to the use as such; however, he did not believe that it should be located in an R-1 District. He stated that the present occupants had been given keys to the building for the expressed purpose of cleaning it up with the possibility that a lease might be acceptable to the owner of the building. However, since such occupancy would result in the removal of the property's present tax exempt status, the United Arab Republic had refused to accept the lease. Taxes on the property would amount to \$4,600 a year; and, since the building rents for only \$1,000 per month, the United Arab Republic felt that it could not afford to lose its tax exempt status.

The Director stated that the issues of tax exemption and trespassing would have to be resolved by the owner of the building; such matters are not within the province of the City Planning Commission. The possibility of a code violation had been investigated by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and, to the best of his knowledge, the occupants of the building are not presently violating the provisions of the City Planning Code. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would continue to investigate the use periodically; and, if a violation becomes apparent, the Zoning Administrator will prepare a cease and desist order.

Commissioner Mellon asked if Mr. Maher had indicated that the building is being used for the rehabilitation of drug addicts. Mr. Steele replied in the negative and stated that Mr. Maher had informed him that the building would be used as a residence for a married couple and five unrelated individuals.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that it was unfortunate that the Commission should be called upon to clear up such problems which had been caused by complications created by the agents of the building's owner. He stated that keys should never be given out except to legal occupants. Furthermore, it is the agent's responsibility to know about zoning and he should obtain a statement in writing that any use proposed is compatible with the zoning of a property and to include a clause in the lease specifying that the use of the property must conform with the standards established by the City Planning Code. He imagined that the present occupants of the building at 3001 Pacific Avenue would maintain a long-term possession of the premises because of the actions taken by the out-of-town owner's agent; and he felt that the situation was extremely regretable.



President Newman requested that the Pacific Heights Improvement Association contact the Department of City Planning if evidence becomes available that the use of the building does violate any of the provision of the City Planning Code, in which event a cease and desist order could be issued.

R71.34 - Vacation of a portion of Upper Terrace east of Monument Way  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of August 19, 1971)

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, stated that this matter had been taken under advisement from the Commission's meeting of August 19, 1971, to enable the staff of the Department of City Planning to notify the owners of properties on the north side of the street of the proposed street vacation. He displayed a profile map of the properties located on the south side of Upper Terrace and explained why foundation work for any buildings to be constructed on those properties would be considerably less expensive if the street vacation request were to be approved. In either case, the buildings would legally be able to rise to a point 30 feet above the curb line of the street.

The Director noted that he had previously recommended that the street vacation be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan. At that time, the Commission had questioned whether the approval could include a condition designed to protect the views presently enjoyed from properties located on the upper side of the street; and he had replied in the negative. Furthermore, he had been advised by the staff that a private covenant by the present owners of the properties to preserve existing views would be unenforceable because it would not be of benefit to the properties. Under the circumstances, there did not appear to be any way, public or private, to assure that the existing views could be protected unless the individuals involved wished to get together to discuss the sale of air rights above a certain level. He did not feel that the street would ever be widened to its legal width because of the construction cost which would be involved; and, therefore, he repeated his recommendation that the vacation request be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the matter had been taken under advisement from the previous meeting so owners on the other side of the street could be notified of the applicants' proposal; and he had been in favor of that delay. However, he did not feel that the Commission should continue to delay action on the matter in an effort to encourage private settlement of the new issue.

Mr. McCormick, representing the applicants, advised the Commission that the owner of the three most easterly lots in question would be delighted to sell her property; however, he acknowledged that her asking price is somewhat high, especially in view of the fact that at least two of the lots are virtually unbuildable. He doubted that a building any higher than 9 or 10 feet would ever be constructed on the remaining lot. He indicated that the second lot from the west is also for sale.



The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from A.L. Starr and John W. Dowler, Gerald D. Gill, and Kenneth Wilson, in opposition to the proposed street vacation. Mr. Starr and Mr. Dowler further requested that the Commission's action on the proposal be postponed pending their return from vacation. The letters stressed the fact that the subject portion of Upper Terrace is extremely narrow and suggested that the road bed should, in fact, be widened to accommodate more vehicular traffic on the street and to allow better access for fire fighting equipment.

James D. Burschell, attorney for Mr. Wilson, remarked that widening of the road bed of Upper Terrace to the existing curb line would improve the flow of traffic on the street and would solve the access problem of the lots located on the south side of the street. He informed the Commission that the book entitled "San Francisco at your Feet" had remarked on the impressive view presently available from the subject portion of Upper Terrace; and he distributed a photograph of that panoramic view to the members of the Commission. If the street, which is owned by the City, were to be vacated, buildings could be constructed on the properties to the south which would completely destroy the view which is presently available, not just for property owners on the other side of the street but for the many citizens and visitors who come to the area to enjoy the panorama. He felt that the street vacation request should be disapproved and that the owners of the properties on the south side of the street should proceed to construct buildings on the lower portions of their properties if they so desire.

Robert McSheehy, 304 Upper Terrace, stated that his family had owned property in the area since 1914. His own view would probably not be affected by construction of buildings on the vacant lots; however, he was concerned about the effect which blocking of the view would have on the neighborhood and on the City as a whole.

Michael Murphy, 308 Upper Terrace, stated that his principal complaint was that the proposed vacation of the street had not previously been discussed with residents of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Schultz, a resident of the area, stated that she presently has a view over the vacant properties; and, as a result, she objected to any street vacation which would make it possible for buildings to be constructed on the Upper Terrace frontages of those lots. She also stressed that the particular curve in question is extremely dangerous at the present time; and she believed that approval of the street vacation request would not ameliorate the traffic problem.

Mr. Wilson remarked that there are already 216 residences fronting on Upper Terrace between Clifford Terrace and the Olympus Monument; and, given the fact that Upper Terrace is a cul-de-sac, he did not feel that it would be desirable to have as many as 18 additional automobiles backing into the blind hairpin turn presently under consideration. The additional automobiles would also interfere with pedestrian traffic on the street. He felt that the request for



vacation of a portion of the street should be disapproved; however, if the Commission were disposed to act favorably on the matter, he hoped that its decision could be delayed so that plans could be prepared which would be for the benefit of many people rather than for just a few individuals.

Commissioner Porter asked if it would be impossible to develop the subject lots if the subject portion of the street were not vacated or if the street vacation would merely make it more economically desirable for the owners of the vacant lots to undertake development. The Director replied that the street vacation would render development of the vacant lots less costly.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. McCormick to give an indication of the height of the buildings which might be constructed on the vacant lots. Mr. McCormick, speaking only for himself and not for the owners of the other vacant parcels of land, stated that he would probably construct 2 floors of occupancy above a two car garage for a total height of 26 or 27 feet; and he pointed out that such a building would conform to the height of other buildings presently existing in the area.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that approval of the street vacation request would result in the loss of a heritage of open space; and he pointed out that disapproval of the vacation request would not compromise any of the rights presently enjoyed by the owners of the vacant lots. While the vacant lots might be more difficult to develop if the subject portion of the street is not vacated, development would still not be impossible. Under the circumstances, he moved that the proposed street vacation be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, who indicated that he agreed with the statements which had been made by Commissioner Ritchie.

Commissioner Porter stated that she would vote in support of the motion; however, she did not feel that any private property owners should have the right to expect another property owner to keep his property vacant for open space.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 6-1 to instruct the Director of Planning to report that the proposed vacation of a portion of Upper Terrace easterly of Monument Way, as shown on SUR-171, is in conflict with the Master Plan because it would result in a loss of public open space and preclude any possibility of realigning Upper Terrace in the future. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Newman, Porter, Ritchie, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Mellon voted "No".

#### CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED ADOPTION OF THE URBAN DESIGN PLAN AS PART OF THE CITY'S MASTER PLAN

(Under Advisement from Meeting of July 21, 1971. The location of the meeting had been transferred from Room 282, City Hall, to 100 Larkin Street; and notice to that effect was posted at Room 282, City Hall.)



President Newman asked for the Director's recommendation on this matter.

The Director made the following statement:

"At the conclusion of the Public Hearing on July 21, the Commission gave an additional period of two weeks for further written comments on the Urban Design Plan. A week ago, the Department Staff distributed to the Commission, to the Urban Design Advisory Committee and to the major organizations that had made comments, a lengthy analysis of the comments received. That report recommended modifications for incorporation in the Plan.

"Within the past week or so, some additional correspondence has been received on the Plan, and as was true earlier this correspondence tended toward a discussion of implementation rather than the Plan itself. Supervisor Pelosi has suggested that the Commission consider a procedure for review of all major buildings on Russian Hill, and Supervisor Feinstein has inquired as to the suitability of a 40-foot height limit in the Haight-Ashbury area. Also, the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council has renewed its request for such a height limit, asking that the Commission take steps to impose it.

"For the Haight-Ashbury, the Staff's report of last week recommends modification of the height guidelines map in the Urban Design Plan to call for a 40-foot height on both sides of the Panhandle, and to reduce the degree of height along Stanyan Street south of the Panhandle. The other recommendations in the staff report have responded to a number of other types of community concerns.

"We have for the Commission's consideration a draft Resolution for adoption of the Urban Design Plan, pages 13 through 132, as a part of the Master Plan."

Subsequently, the Director read the draft resolution which contained the following resolves:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby adopt as an amendment to the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and as part thereof, pages 13 through and including 132 of that certain document entitled 'The Urban Design Plan for the Comprehensive Plan of San Francisco', dated May 1971, consisting of text, maps and illustrations, with the modifications described in the memorandum of August 19, 1971, from the Director of Planning to the City Planning Commission, entitled 'Comments Received on the Urban Design Plan';

1920-1921  
1921-1922  
1922-1923  
1923-1924

1924-1925  
1925-1926  
1926-1927  
1927-1928  
1928-1929  
1929-1930  
1930-1931  
1931-1932  
1932-1933  
1933-1934  
1934-1935  
1935-1936  
1936-1937  
1937-1938  
1938-1939  
1939-1940  
1940-1941  
1941-1942  
1942-1943  
1943-1944  
1944-1945  
1945-1946  
1946-1947  
1947-1948  
1948-1949  
1949-1950  
1950-1951  
1951-1952  
1952-1953  
1953-1954  
1954-1955  
1955-1956  
1956-1957  
1957-1958  
1958-1959  
1959-1960  
1960-1961  
1961-1962  
1962-1963  
1963-1964  
1964-1965  
1965-1966  
1966-1967  
1967-1968  
1968-1969  
1969-1970  
1970-1971  
1971-1972  
1972-1973  
1973-1974  
1974-1975  
1975-1976  
1976-1977  
1977-1978  
1978-1979  
1979-1980  
1980-1981  
1981-1982  
1982-1983  
1983-1984  
1984-1985  
1985-1986  
1986-1987  
1987-1988  
1988-1989  
1989-1990  
1990-1991  
1991-1992  
1992-1993  
1993-1994  
1994-1995  
1995-1996  
1996-1997  
1997-1998  
1998-1999  
1999-2000  
2000-2001  
2001-2002  
2002-2003  
2003-2004  
2004-2005  
2005-2006  
2006-2007  
2007-2008  
2008-2009  
2009-2010  
2010-2011  
2011-2012  
2012-2013  
2013-2014  
2014-2015  
2015-2016  
2016-2017  
2017-2018  
2018-2019  
2019-2020  
2020-2021  
2021-2022  
2022-2023  
2023-2024  
2024-2025  
2025-2026  
2026-2027  
2027-2028  
2028-2029  
2029-2030  
2030-2031  
2031-2032  
2032-2033  
2033-2034  
2034-2035  
2035-2036  
2036-2037  
2037-2038  
2038-2039  
2039-2040  
2040-2041  
2041-2042  
2042-2043  
2043-2044  
2044-2045  
2045-2046  
2046-2047  
2047-2048  
2048-2049  
2049-2050  
2050-2051  
2051-2052  
2052-2053  
2053-2054  
2054-2055  
2055-2056  
2056-2057  
2057-2058  
2058-2059  
2059-2060  
2060-2061  
2061-2062  
2062-2063  
2063-2064  
2064-2065  
2065-2066  
2066-2067  
2067-2068  
2068-2069  
2069-2070  
2070-2071  
2071-2072  
2072-2073  
2073-2074  
2074-2075  
2075-2076  
2076-2077  
2077-2078  
2078-2079  
2079-2080  
2080-2081  
2081-2082  
2082-2083  
2083-2084  
2084-2085  
2085-2086  
2086-2087  
2087-2088  
2088-2089  
2089-2090  
2090-2091  
2091-2092  
2092-2093  
2093-2094  
2094-2095  
2095-2096  
2096-2097  
2097-2098  
2098-2099  
2099-20100  
20100-20101  
20101-20102  
20102-20103  
20103-20104  
20104-20105  
20105-20106  
20106-20107  
20107-20108  
20108-20109  
20109-20110  
20110-20111  
20111-20112  
20112-20113  
20113-20114  
20114-20115  
20115-20116  
20116-20117  
20117-20118  
20118-20119  
20119-20120  
20120-20121  
20121-20122  
20122-20123  
20123-20124  
20124-20125  
20125-20126  
20126-20127  
20127-20128  
20128-20129  
20129-20130  
20130-20131  
20131-20132  
20132-20133  
20133-20134  
20134-20135  
20135-20136  
20136-20137  
20137-20138  
20138-20139  
20139-20140  
20140-20141  
20141-20142  
20142-20143  
20143-20144  
20144-20145  
20145-20146  
20146-20147  
20147-20148  
20148-20149  
20149-20150  
20150-20151  
20151-20152  
20152-20153  
20153-20154  
20154-20155  
20155-20156  
20156-20157  
20157-20158  
20158-20159  
20159-20160  
20160-20161  
20161-20162  
20162-20163  
20163-20164  
20164-20165  
20165-20166  
20166-20167  
20167-20168  
20168-20169  
20169-20170  
20170-20171  
20171-20172  
20172-20173  
20173-20174  
20174-20175  
20175-20176  
20176-20177  
20177-20178  
20178-20179  
20179-20180  
20180-20181  
20181-20182  
20182-20183  
20183-20184  
20184-20185  
20185-20186  
20186-20187  
20187-20188  
20188-20189  
20189-20190  
20190-20191  
20191-20192  
20192-20193  
20193-20194  
20194-20195  
20195-20196  
20196-20197  
20197-20198  
20198-20199  
20199-20200  
20200-20201  
20201-20202  
20202-20203  
20203-20204  
20204-20205  
20205-20206  
20206-20207  
20207-20208  
20208-20209  
20209-20210  
20210-20211  
20211-20212  
20212-20213  
20213-20214  
20214-20215  
20215-20216  
20216-20217  
20217-20218  
20218-20219  
20219-20220  
20220-20221  
20221-20222  
20222-20223  
20223-20224  
20224-20225  
20225-20226  
20226-20227  
20227-20228  
20228-20229  
20229-20230  
20230-20231  
20231-20232  
20232-20233  
20233-20234  
20234-20235  
20235-20236  
20236-20237  
20237-20238  
20238-20239  
20239-20240  
20240-20241  
20241-20242  
20242-20243  
20243-20244  
20244-20245  
20245-20246  
20246-20247  
20247-20248  
20248-20249  
20249-20250  
20250-20251  
20251-20252  
20252-20253  
20253-20254  
20254-20255  
20255-20256  
20256-20257  
20257-20258  
20258-20259  
20259-20260  
20260-20261  
20261-20262  
20262-20263  
20263-20264  
20264-20265  
20265-20266  
20266-20267  
20267-20268  
20268-20269  
20269-20270  
20270-20271  
20271-20272  
20272-20273  
20273-20274  
20274-20275  
20275-20276  
20276-20277  
20277-20278  
20278-20279  
20279-20280  
20280-20281  
20281-20282  
20282-20283  
20283-20284  
20284-20285  
20285-20286  
20286-20287  
20287-20288  
20288-20289  
20289-20290  
20290-20291  
20291-20292  
20292-20293  
20293-20294  
20294-20295  
20295-20296  
20296-20297  
20297-20298  
20298-20299  
20299-202100  
202100-202101  
202101-202102  
202102-202103  
202103-202104  
202104-202105  
202105-202106  
202106-202107  
202107-202108  
202108-202109  
202109-202110  
202110-202111  
202111-202112  
202112-202113  
202113-202114  
202114-202115  
202115-202116  
202116-202117  
202117-202118  
202118-202119  
202119-202120  
202120-202121  
202121-202122  
202122-202123  
202123-202124  
202124-202125  
202125-202126  
202126-202127  
202127-202128  
202128-202129  
202129-202130  
202130-202131  
202131-202132  
202132-202133  
202133-202134  
202134-202135  
202135-202136  
202136-202137  
202137-202138  
202138-202139  
202139-202140  
202140-202141  
202141-202142  
202142-202143  
202143-202144  
202144-202145  
202145-202146  
202146-202147  
202147-202148  
202148-202149  
202149-202150  
202150-202151  
202151-202152  
202152-202153  
202153-202154  
202154-202155  
202155-202156  
202156-202157  
202157-202158  
202158-202159  
202159-202160  
202160-202161  
202161-202162  
202162-202163  
202163-202164  
202164-202165  
202165-202166  
202166-202167  
202167-202168  
202168-202169  
202169-202170  
202170-202171  
202171-202172  
202172-202173  
202173-202174  
202174-202175  
202175-202176  
202176-202177  
202177-202178  
202178-202179  
202179-202180  
202180-202181  
202181-202182  
202182-202183  
202183-202184  
202184-202185  
202185-202186  
202186-202187  
202187-202188  
202188-202189  
202189-202190  
202190-202191  
202191-202192  
202192-202193  
202193-202194  
202194-202195  
202195-202196  
202196-202197  
202197-202198  
202198-202199  
202199-202200  
202200-202201  
202201-202202  
202202-202203  
202203-202204  
202204-202205  
202205-202206  
202206-202207  
202207-202208  
202208-202209  
202209-202210  
202210-202211  
202211-202212  
202212-202213  
202213-202214  
202214-202215  
202215-202216  
202216-202217  
202217-202218  
202218-202219  
202219-202220  
202220-202221  
202221-202222  
202222-202223  
202223-202224  
202224-202225  
202225-202226  
202226-202227  
202227-202228  
202228-202229  
202229-202230  
202230-202231  
202231-202232  
202232-202233  
202233-202234  
202234-202235  
202235-202236  
202236-202237  
202237-202238  
202238-202239  
202239-202240  
202240-202241  
202241-202242  
202242-202243  
202243-202244  
202244-202245  
202245-202246  
202246-202247  
202247-202248  
202248-202249  
202249-202250  
202250-202251  
202251-202252  
202252-202253  
202253-202254  
202254-202255  
202255-202256  
202256-202257  
202257-202258  
202258-202259  
202259-202260  
202260-202261  
202261-202262  
202262-202263  
202263-202264  
202264-202265  
202265-202266  
202266-202267  
202267-202268  
202268-202269  
202269-202270  
202270-202271  
202271-202272  
202272-202273  
202273-202274  
202274-202275  
202275-202276  
202276-202277  
202277-202278  
202278-202279  
202279-202280  
202280-202281  
202281-202282  
202282-202283  
202283-202284  
202284-202285  
202285-202286  
202286-202287  
202287-202288  
202288-202289  
202289-202290  
202290-202291  
202291-202292  
202292-202293  
202293-202294  
202294-202295  
202295-202296  
202296-202297  
202297-202298  
202298-202299  
202299-202300  
202300-202301  
202301-202302  
202302-202303  
202303-202304  
202304-202305  
202305-202306  
202306-202307  
202307-202308  
202308-202309  
202309-202310  
202310-202311  
202311-202312  
202312-202313  
202313-202314  
202314-202315  
202315-202316  
202316-202317  
202317-202318  
202318-202319  
202319-202320  
202320-202321  
202321-202322  
202322-202323  
202323-202324  
202324-202325  
202325-202326  
202326-202327  
202327-202328  
202328-202329  
202329-202330  
202330-202331  
202331-202332  
202332-202333  
202333-202334  
202334-202335  
202335-202336  
202336-202337  
202337-202338  
202338-202339  
202339-202340  
202340-202341  
202341-202342  
202342-202343  
202343-202344  
202344-202345  
202345-202346  
202346-202347  
202347-202348  
202348-202349  
202349-202350  
202350-202351  
202351-202352  
202352-202353  
202353-202354  
202354-202355  
202355-202356  
202356-202357  
202357-202358  
202358-202359  
202359-202360  
202360-202361  
202361-202362  
202362-202363  
202363-202364  
202364-202365  
202365-202366  
202366-202367  
202367-202368  
202368-202369  
202369-202370  
202370-202371  
202371-202372  
202372-202373  
202373-202374  
202374-202375  
202375-202376  
202376-202377  
202377-202378  
202378-202379  
202379-202380  
202380-202381  
202381-202382  
202382-202383  
202383-202384  
202384-202385  
202385-202386  
202386-202387  
202387-202388  
202388-202389  
202389-202390  
202390-202391  
202391-202392  
202392-202393  
202393-202394  
202394-202395  
202395-202396  
202396-202397  
202397-202398  
202398-202399  
202399-202400  
202400-202401  
202401-202402  
202402-202403  
202403-202404  
202404-202405  
202405-202406  
202406-202407  
202407-202408  
202408-202409  
202409-202410  
202410-202411  
202411-202412  
202412-202413  
202413-202414  
202414-202415  
202415-202416  
202416-202417  
202417-202418  
202418-202419  
202419-202420  
202420-202421  
202421-202422  
202422-202423  
202423-202424  
202424-202425  
202425-202426  
202426-202427  
202427-202428  
202428-202429  
202429-202430  
202430-202431  
202431-202432  
202432-202433  
202433-202434  
202434-202435  
202435-202436  
202436-202437  
202437-202438  
202438-202439  
202439-202440  
202440-202441  
202441-202442  
202442-202443  
202443-202444  
202444-202445  
202445-202446  
202446-202447  
202447-202448  
202448-202449  
202449-202450  
202450-202451  
202451-202452  
202452-202453  
202453-202454  
202454-202455  
202455-202456  
202456-202457  
202457-202458  
202458-202459  
202459-202460  
202460-202461  
202461-202462  
202462-202463  
202463-202464  
202464-202465  
202465-202466  
202466-202467  
202467-202468  
202468-202469  
202469-202470  
202470-202471  
202471-202472  
202472-202473  
202473-202474  
202474-202475  
202475-202476  
202476-202477  
202477-202478  
202478-202479  
202479-202480  
202480-202481  
202481-202482  
202482-202483  
202483-202484  
202484-202485  
202485-202486  
202486-202487  
202487-202488  
202488-202489  
202489-202490  
202490-202491  
202491-202492  
202492-202493  
202493-202494  
202494-202495  
202495-202496  
202496-202497  
202497-202498  
202498-202499  
202499-202500  
202500-202501  
202501-202502  
202502-202503  
202503-202504  
202504-202505  
202505-202506  
202506-202507  
202507-202508  
202508-202509  
202509-202510  
202510-202511  
202511-202512  
202512-202513  
202513-202514  
202514-202515  
202515-202516  
202516-202517  
202517-202518  
202518-202519  
202519-202520  
202520-202521  
202521-202522  
202522-202523  
202523-202524  
202524-202525  
202525-202526  
202526-202527  
202527-202528  
202528-202529  
202529-202530  
202530-202531  
202531-202532  
202532-202533  
202533-202534  
202534-202535  
202535-202536  
202536-202537  
202537-202538  
202538-202539  
202539-202540  
202540-202541  
202541-202542  
202542-202543  
202543-202544  
202544-202545  
202545-202546  
202546-202547  
202547-202548  
202548-202549  
202549-202550  
202550-202551  
202551-202552  
202552-202553  
202553-202554  
202554-202555  
202555-202556  
202556-202557  
202557-202558  
202558-202559  
202559-202560  
202560-202561  
202561-202562  
202562-202563  
202563-202564  
202564-202565  
202565-202566  
202566-202567  
202567-202568  
202568-202569  
202569-202570  
202570-202571  
202571-202572  
202572-202573  
202573-202574  
202574-202575  
202575-202576  
202576-202577  
202577-202578  
202578-202579  
202579-202580  
202580-202581  
202581-202582  
202582-202583  
202583-202584  
202584-202585  
202585-202586  
202586-202587  
202587-202588  
202588-202589  
202589-202590  
202590-202591  
202591-202592  
202592-202593  
202593-202594  
202594-202595  
202595-202596  
202596-202597  
202597-202598  
202598-202599  
202599-202600  
202600-202601  
202601-202602  
202602-202603  
202603-202604  
202604-202605  
202605-202606  
202606-202607  
202607-202608  
202608-202609  
202609-202610  
202610-202611  
202611-202612  
202612-202613  
202613-202614  
202614-202615  
202615-202616  
202616

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That said Urban Design Plan as so modified constitute a substantial amendment and addition to the existing Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, and any provisions of the existing Master Plan, whether appearing in the text or on a map, that are inconsistent with the said Master Plan amendment relating to urban design are hereby declared to be of no further force and effect;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the President of the City Planning Commission and the Director of Planning shall record the Commission action on the documents constituting this Master Plan amendment, and the Secretary of the Commission is hereby directed to certify an attested copy thereof to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, and the Director of Planning is hereby directed to publish the amendment in sufficient quantity for distribution to the public, excluding such illustrative material as he may deem it necessary and practical to exclude in such publication."

It was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the draft resolution be adopted.

After discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6745.

Commissioner Rueda remarked that it might have seemed that the Commission had taken quick action on a very important resolution; however, he pointed out that the Urban Design Plan had been in preparation for a long time with community participation, and that members of the Commission and staff had attended hearings and many meetings to discuss the Urban Design Plan and were thus familiar with every aspect of the plan.

Commissioner Ritchie, remarking that no other city in the United States had yet adopted such a plan, felt that the action which the Commission had just taken constituted a great step forward in planning for San Francisco. Furthermore, he believed that the adopted plan testified to the caliber, talent and genius of the staff of the Department of City Planning and of the Director of Planning.

President Newman, noting that several members of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee were present in the audience, again expressed his appreciation to them for the assistance which they had provided in preparation of the plan. He then called on the Director of Planning to present a report on interim controls for height and bulk of buildings as requested by the Commission during its meeting on August 19, 1971.

The Director read the following statement:



AUGUST 26, 1971

"A request was made, at the Planning Commission meeting of August 19, 1971, that the Department staff prepare for consideration by the Commission a draft resolution that would begin the process of implementation of the height and bulk guidelines of the Urban Design Plan.

"A draft resolution has been drawn up which would declare the intention of the Commission to reclassify property throughout the city for the purpose of height and bulk regulations. The resolution would have the effect of requiring conformity of new construction to the Urban Design guidelines, pending the refinement of more specific standards and the accomplishment of hearings and final action by the Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Commission hearings would commence in about six months.

"The resolution would be supplemented by some additional written material that is designed to remove any ambiguity from the application of the resolution in the interim period. This material is a descriptive 'Outline of Interim Height and Bulk Controls', which the resolution would adopt for the guidance of the Commission, the staff and the public. The main points in the outline are as follows:

"1. The outline specifies that it is Policies 5 and 6 of the Urban Design Plan that are being applied, and that all new buildings and enlargements are affected.

"2. It makes clear the fact that no existing height limits in the city, or other requirements of zoning or other laws, are made less restrictive by the resolution. Such changes could be made only by a legislative enactment, and it has yet to be determined whether any raising of height limits will actually be proposed for the final height districts.

"3. The outline also refers to a composite map of height and bulk standards, drawn for administrative convenience, which combines the height and bulk maps of the Urban Design Plan. This map includes the legends transferred from the other two maps, and for additional convenience the legends are reproduced at the end of the outline.

"4. Finally, the outline notes that Planning Commission review will be required in four types of situations where the Urban Design Plan already provides for review or flexibility. This review by the Commission must be through its discretionary powers, since the conditional use process can be established only by final legislation. The four review situations are these:

"a. Development in open space, which requires close control and which in many cases already has some form of Commission review.



AUGUST 26, 1971

"b. Flexibility within the height ranges. The final controls will set definite height limits, but the Urban Design Plan only specifies ranges of height. For a building at the bottom end of the range or below, there would be no review. The Commission could approve a height within the range specified, but could not go above the top of the range. Although two areas are shown in the Plan to have no height guideline -- most of the downtown office district and the top of Nob Hill -- it is felt that no part of the city should be completely without review as to height in the interim period, and for that reason the legend calls for review in these two areas of buildings exceeding 400 feet in height. It should be noted that part of Nob Hill already has review of buildings over 160 feet in height by Conditional Use.

"c. Development at the top of Russian Hill. This would be the only area in which point towers would be specially permitted above a basic limit of 40 feet. The outline sets down a number of criteria implicit in the Urban Design Plan for such review, and establishes an absolute upper limit of 300 feet in this area.

"d. Flexibility for bulk in the interim period. In the final standards, flexibility in the bulk limits would be more fully defined. What this outline does is to express the intent of the Urban Design Plan through a listing of the compensating factors in building design that will lessen the appearance of bulk and therefore permit the guideline figures of the Plan to be exceeded to some degree. These factors correspond closely to those described in Preliminary Report No. 8 of the Urban Design Study. There is no absolute maximum set in this outline for bulk, and it would be impractical now to do so, but the factors listed would have to be present in a significant way if the bulk guidelines were to be exceeded at all."

The Director then distributed and read the following draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission:

"WHEREAS, The height and bulk of new development are matters of significant concern to the San Francisco community;



"WHEREAS, These concerns are reflected and emphasized in the document entitled, 'The Urban Design Plan for the Comprehensive Plan of San Francisco', published in May 1971 after extensive study;

"WHEREAS, Said Urban Design Plan was the subject of public hearings and was adopted by the City Planning Commission as a part of the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco on August 26, 1971, by Resolution No. 6745;

"WHEREAS, Due to the intense interest in questions concerning the height and bulk of buildings, the Planning Commission desires to give high priority to the implementation of the portion of the Urban Design Plan pertaining to Major New Development, and most specifically the guidelines for height and bulk of buildings; and

"WHEREAS, Enactment of permanent standards and controls for height and bulk of buildings on a citywide basis can occur only after more detailed study and after a period of public hearings and consideration;

"WHEREAS, In the interim there is a strong need for controls that will regulate the form of construction and prevent violation of the policies of the Urban Design Plan pertaining to height and bulk;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission does hereby declare its intention to reclassify property throughout the City and County of San Francisco and amend the text and maps of the City Planning Code, by extension and creation of districts for the control of height and bulk, pursuant to the maps in the Urban Design Plan entitled 'Urban Design Guidelines for Height of Buildings' and 'Urban Design Guidelines for Bulk of Buildings', as modified by the changes in the memorandum of August 19, 1971, from the Director of Planning to the City Planning Commission, entitled 'Comments Received on the Urban Design Plan', which maps are a part of the Master Plan element adopted by Resolution No. 6745;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission does hereby adopt for its guidance the document entitled 'Outline of Interim Height and Bulk Controls', dated August 26, 1971, which document describes how the height and bulk controls are to be applied on an interim basis and sets up certain procedures for reviews by the City Planning Commission;



"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That this declaration of intention and the controls and procedures hereunder shall remain in effect, unless modified by further resolution of this Commission, until the effective date of permanent citywide height and bulk controls enacted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the Urban Design Plan;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Zoning Administrator is hereby directed to set, not later than 20 days after the date of this resolution, a time and place for hearing on citywide height and bulk controls, which time shall be within a reasonable period after the date of this resolution allowing for study and refinement of the height and bulk controls specified in this resolution."

Commissioner Rueda asked if public hearings would be scheduled for the Commission to consider all of the permanent standards and controls being proposed. The Director replied in the affirmative. He stated that the staff of the Department would prepare a detailed draft ordinance with proposals for specific height and bulk limits rather than the ranges indicated in the Urban Design Plan; and, following preparation of the draft, a series of public hearings would be held by the Commission before recommendations are transmitted to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Rueda then asked for clarification of the procedures to be followed during the interim period. The Director proposed a hypothetical situation in which an R-4 property would be governed by an interim height range of 88 feet to 160 feet. Any permit application for a building with a height of up to 88 feet would not have to be reviewed by the Commission; and any building permit application for a building in excess of 160 feet could not be considered by the Commission. Any building permit application for a building with a height between 88 feet and 160 feet would automatically be brought to the Commission for review and action; and the action taken by the Commission would be appealable to the Board of Permit Appeals.

Commissioner Rueda asked if the proposed interim controls would increase the height or density allowances in any parts of the city. The Director replied in the negative.

Commissioner Porter felt that the interim controls would, in effect, constitute a "freeze" to protect the integrity of the Urban Design Plan until public hearings have been held and final decisions have been reached by the Commission on specific height and bulk controls for the various neighborhoods of the City. She remarked that a similar "freeze" had been in effect prior to final adoption of the Downtown Zoning Ordinance.

The Director stated that he would not describe the procedures involved as a "freeze"; rather, the interim controls would provide that any new buildings would have to conform to both the existing zoning and the new height and bulk regulations which would be under consideration by the Commission. The only buildings which could not be constructed would be those which would exceed either the existing zoning standards or the proposed height and bulk limitations.



President Newman asked if the Commission would have an opportunity to revise the proposed standards during the interim period if it becomes apparent that serious inequities or injustices are involved. Commissioner Fleishhacker assumed that the same authority which would enable the Commission to establish the interim controls could be used to change the controls at a later date.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he did not regard the interim controls as a "freeze" on new construction; rather, the controls would establish definite guidelines for the height and bulk of buildings which would enable prospective developers to know where they stand with regard to the law.

President Newman agreed with Commissioner Ritchie. He then asked how the proposed interim controls might affect the proposed buildings known to the staff for which building permit applications had not yet been filed. The Director replied that all of the proposed buildings known to the staff, with the exception of one, would conform to the interim height controls which were being proposed.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the draft resolution be adopted. He agreed with Commissioners Ritchie and Newman that the interim controls which were being proposed would not constitute a "freeze" on new development; and, in fact, he felt that the interim controls might actually encourage new development. He remarked that the Urban Design Plan is concerned with conservation and development; and he pointed out that height and bulk are directly related to development. He also emphasized that the interim controls were not being urged solely by the staff of the Department of City Planning but by the community at large as evidenced by the comments which had been made during the public hearings which had been held by the Commission. Establishment of the interim controls would clarify the legal limits for new construction in the City, allowing bona fide developers to know what types of buildings would be acceptable; and the controls would discourage a sudden rush of applications for undesirable buildings. He felt that the interim controls would beneficially affect the quality of development in the City; and they would provide the Commission with an opportunity to give ample time to the study of specific controls which will be recommended to the Board of Supervisors for enactment. He noted that the City Planning Commission had already held several hearings on the Urban Design Plan; and he felt that it was extremely important that the Commission should act on the interim controls during its present meeting, particularly since such an action would have an effect on the negative efforts of a local group of people, who are not professional planners, to control the height of new buildings in San Francisco by establishing what would be, in fact, a "freeze" on all new buildings having a height of more than six stories.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mellon.

Commissioner Porter stated that the interim controls which were being proposed would constitute a "freeze". She remarked, however, that the country is benefiting from a 90-day price and wage "freeze"; and she felt that the City of San Francisco would benefit from the interim "freeze" on height and bulk of buildings which would protect the integrity of the Urban Design Plan until specific controls are considered and recommended to the Supervisors for enactment.



The Director suggested that the interim controls might be viewed as "refrigeration to keep things from spoiling" rather than as a "freeze".

Commissioner Finn asked if the resolution which was being considered by the Commission would have the force of the law during the interim period. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Finn remarked that appeals would be possible after specific height and bulk limitations have been enacted by the Board of Supervisors; and he indicated that he was concerned about the fact that no appeals would be possible during the interim period.

The Director stated that only buildings which exceed the maximum interim height control would be denied the right of an appeal; he stated that such would be the case with permanent height controls; and he indicated that similar circumstances of interim regulation had prevailed for a period of 1½ years when the Downtown zoning ordinance was under consideration by the Commission.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Resolution No. 6746.

President Newman stated that he had received a telephone call from Mayor Alioto in which the Mayor stated that he had endorsed the Urban Design Plan since its inception and that he hoped that the interim controls would be adopted by the City Planning Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 2, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 2, 1971, at 1:00 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Patricia Peterson, Planner II; Alec Bash, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

100 LARKIN STREET 1:30 P.M.

CURRENT MATTERS

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6747 be adopted to express the Commission's sorrow on the recent sudden death of M. Justin Herman, Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency. President Newman then recessed the meeting until 2:50 p.m. to allow the members of the Commission to attend memorial services which were being held for Mr. Herman.

2:50 P.M. Room 282 City Hall

ZM71.11 - 1231-39 19th Avenue, west line, 150 feet south of Lincoln Way and 1228 20th Avenue, east line, 175 feet south of Lincoln Way. R-3 to an R-3-C District.  
(Under Advisement from meeting of August 5, 1971)

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Michael W. Everett, Real Estate Representative for McDonalds Restaurants, requesting that the subject application be withdrawn.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the request for withdrawal be approved.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6748 be adopted and that approval be given to the withdrawal of Application ZM71.11.



September 2, 1971

ZM71.12 - 15th Street, south line, 176 feet west of Market Street  
R-3 to a C-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which is triangular in shape with a 95-foot frontage on 15th Street and a total area of 3,871 square feet. The property, which is zoned R-3, has been used as a parking lot and as an exit for the Beck Motel which is located at 2222 Market Street. The owner of the property had requested that it be reclassified to C-2 so that it could be used for expansion of the adjacent motel.

William J. Beck, the applicant, stated that he intended to construct 10 motel rooms on the subject site. He indicated that the entrance to the motel would continue to be located on Market Street, with no vehicular access whatsoever from 15th Street. He stated that the building which he proposed to construct on the lot would have a residential appearance as seen from 15th Street; and he noted that the new building would eliminate from view the blank wall which is presently seen from 15th Street. He displayed a rendering which he had prepared of the proposed building and indicated that he had made certain changes on the site plan which he had previously submitted to the staff of the Department of City Planning. In conclusion, he indicated that approximately 14 additional parking spaces would be provided for the 10 new motel rooms which he intended to construct.

Commissioner Finn asked if the staff of the Department of City Planning had been given an opportunity to review the revised plans. The Director replied in the negative. However, since the matter before the Commission concerned a change of zone rather than a conditional use, the details of any specific project which the applicant might propose to construct on the site if it were to be reclassified to C-2 should not have a bearing on the Commission's action on the subject application.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of the subject application.

John Schmid, 2168 15th Street, submitted a petition which had been signed by 22 people who reside on 15th Street. The petition requested that action on the subject application be deferred until a definite site plan, renderings, and elevations of the building could be presented to the immediate community for 30 days of study and discussion. The petition indicated that the site plan should show the automobile flow and number, size, and location of all parking spaces to be provided by the applicant for the existing and proposed motel rooms as well as the location and type of landscaping to be installed on the subject site. The elevation should clearly delineate the character of the new structure; and a sectional sketch should be prepared of the proposed building which would show the relationship between its height and the height of the existing motel. Mr. Schmid



stated that the residents of the area felt that the applicant should demonstrate to them that the proposed addition to the motel would be an asset to 15th Street. The building should be architecturally compatible with other residential buildings on the street; and it should be landscaped with reasonably large trees. He stated that all of the people who had signed the petition were opposed in principle to reclassification of the residential property for commercial use; however, since the present use of the subject property is so unattractive, they would be willing to consider any proposal which might result in a more attractive use.

Eugene L. Mayo, representing the Market, Castro and Duboce Neighborhood Association, supported the request for a 30-day postponement of action by the Commission on the subject application. His organization has scheduled a meeting for September 13; and he indicated that Mr. Beck had accepted an invitation to attend the meeting to discuss his plans.

The Director emphasized that the Commission could not approve the request for reclassification of the property subject to conditions; and, as a result, any use which would conform to the C-2 provisions of the City Planning Code could be constructed on the site if the application were to be approved. He felt that extension of the existing C-2 district onto the subject property to allow minor expansion of the existing motel would be reasonable; and he believed that the proposed motel expansion could be done in a manner which would make the rear of the motel, as seen from 15th Street, more compatible in appearance with the residential character of that street. Furthermore, the expansion could be accomplished in a manner which would not bring additional traffic to 15th Street. He indicated that he had prepared two draft resolutions for consideration by the Commission. The first draft resolution, if adopted, would approve the request for reclassification of the property from R-3 to C-2; and the second draft resolution, if adopted, would announce the Commission's intention to review under its discretionary authority any permit applications based on a C-2 classification of the subject site and of the adjoining commercial frontage on Market Street, with special attention given to the building height, landscaping or other appropriate screening of the commercial activity and accessory parking from the residential streets, restriction of pedestrian and vehicular access primarily to Market Street and requiring design and means of operating off-street parking areas in a manner which would not adversely affect the residential amenities of homes on 15th Street. He recommended that the draft resolutions be adopted; and he offered a personal suggestion to Mr. Beck that he obtain a bona fide architect to draw final plans for the proposed building.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Finn and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the draft resolution approving the request for reclassification be adopted.

Commissioner Porter asked the applicant if he would be willing to employ an architect so that proper plans could be prepared for the proposed building. Mr. Beck replied in the affirmative and indicated that he had already been in contact with August Waegmann.



Commissioner Ritchie asked if residents of the community would be given an opportunity to be heard when the Commission conducts its discretionary review. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the sketches which had been prepared by the applicant had been disappointing; and he agreed with Commissioner Porter that more detailed plans for the building should be prepared by an architect prior to the time that the project is brought before the Commission for discretionary review.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6749 and to approve Application No. ZM71.12. Commissioner Miller abstained from voting.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6750 be adopted to announce the Commission's policy of reviewing under its discretionary authority any permit applications based on a C-2 classification of the subject site. Commissioner Miller abstained from voting.

ZM71.13 - 1627 Revere Avenue, south west line, 100 feet north west of Lane Street.  
R-2 to a C-2 District.

The Secretary stated that a letter had been received from Mrs. Leveret J. Higgins, the applicant, indicating that other property owners in the area had expressed an interest in having their properties reclassified from R-2 to C-2, also; and, as a result, she requested that hearing of the subject application be postponed until a later date so that the requests for reclassification of the other properties could be considered at the same time.

The Director recommended that hearing of the application be postponed until the meeting of November 4.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject application be postponed until the Commission's meeting on November 4, 1971.

CU71.39 - Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center, Post Street, north line, 87.5 feet east of Scott Street.  
Request for an open automobile parking lot with approximately 25 spaces in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation, (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has 55 feet of frontage on Post Street and an area of approximately 9,335 square feet. The property is vacant at the present time. Mount Zion Hospital proposed to grade and pave the property for use as a temporary parking lot for physicians on its staff. The parking lot would contain approximately 25 parking spaces.



Mr. Jenkins, Assistant Administrator of Mount Zion Hospital, stated that the hospital is facing a rather desperate parking problem at the present time. Attempts are being made to acquire property for construction of a parking garage; however, in the meantime, the hospital hoped to obtain permission to use the subject property as a parking lot on a temporary basis. He stated that the hospital would be willing to pave and landscape the site in accordance with any recommendations which might be offered by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

No one else was in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

The Director recommended that the application be approved subject to seven specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. He remarked that there is an obvious need for additional off-street parking to serve Mount Zion Hospital; and he felt that it would be desirable to use the subject property as an interim parking lot until a more substantial facility can be constructed. Furthermore, he felt that a well landscaped parking lot would be compatible with adjacent properties. After paraphrasing the seven conditions which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked Mr. Jenkins if the conditions which were being recommended by the staff would be acceptable to him. Mr. Jenkins replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6751 and that the application be approved subject to the seven conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioner Fleishhacker abstained from voting because he is a member of the Board of Directors of Mount Zion Hospital.

CU71.40 - 834-840 Broderick Street, east line, 95 feet south of Golden Gate Avenue.

Request for authorization to use existing building as a youth hostel to be operated by the Travelers Aid Society, a Philanthropic Institution; in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has a 42.5 foot frontage on Broderick Street, a depth of 37.5 feet and a total area of 5,843.5 square feet. He stated that the City Planning Commission had acted in May, 1970, to authorize use of the first floor of the subject building as offices of the Florence Crittenton Home. The second floor of the building was to have been used for the housing of unwed mothers. Because the demand for such housing has declined, Florence Crittenton Home does not, at this time, need the extra housing; and, as a result, other plans had been made for use of the second floor



of the building. The proposal now before the Commission would involve operation of a youth hostel on the second floor which would accommodate a maximum of 17 young adults between the ages of 18 and 25 who are temporarily in need of inexpensive, safe housing. The youths to be served would be screened by the social work staff of the Travelers Aid Society which is responsible for the administration of the program under the general direction of an Advisory Committee composed of co-operating agencies. The facility would be managed as a youth hostel with a low overnight fees, community kitchen facilities and clear expectations regarding time of arrival and departure. Smoking would not be permitted in sleeping quarters; and all alcoholic beverages and drugs would be unacceptable. The facility would be staffed by three resident counselors of which two would be on duty at all times. Toilet and bathing facilities would be modified as required by the Building Code; no exterior changes would be made. A small identifying sign indicating name only might be installed at a later date. The offices of the Florence Crittenton Home would be retained on the first floor of the building.

Marjorie Montelius, Director of the Travelers Aid Society, stated that the youth hostel program had been in operation in San Francisco for the past 2½ years; and, during that time, several young people had been accommodated. The new quarters in the subject building would be less expensive than the facilities which had previously been used at the Victorian Hotel.

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Dave Tarrant, manager of the Victorian Hotel, which read, in part, as follows:

"I can assure you that there has been no trouble here at the hotel as relating to Travelers Aid. Those that were housed here realized that they were here as guests of the hotel and were to act as guests. That they did."

The Director remarked that the proposed use of the residential portion of the subject building by Travelers Aid would not be significantly different from the authorization which had previously been granted by the Commission to the Florence Crittenton Home. And he noted that the proposed use would be similar in operation to a rooming house which is permitted as a principal use in R-4 zoning districts. He also noted that the proposed use would not alter the residential appearance of the property. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

President Newman asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable to the applicant. Mrs. Montelius replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6752 be adopted and that the application be approved according to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.



S71.2 - 2200-2206 Chestnut Street, north west corner of Pierce Street.  
Request for removal of a 7 feet front setback line along the  
Pierce Street frontage of the property.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which has 72 feet of frontage on Chestnut Street, 55 foot frontage on Pierce Street, and an area of 3,960 square feet. The property is presently occupied by a florist stand, a sandwich stand, a candle shop, and a shoe shine stand. The property has now been leased to the Security Pacific Bank which plans to construct a building using 65 of the 72 feet of frontage on Chestnut Street and the entire frontage on Pierce Street. The owner of the property had filed the subject application requesting that the seven foot front setback along Pierce Street be abolished so that the existing florist stand could be accommodated on the site along with the bank.

Emerson B. Clark, the applicant and the legal owner of the subject property, stated that the property had been owned by his family for approximately 40 years. He hoped that the setback along Pierce Street would be removed so that the proposed bank building could be moved seven feet eastward, thus providing a seven foot strip on the west side of the property for the florist stand. Since the sidewalk on Pierce Street is presently 16 feet 6 inches wide, removal of the seven foot setback would still leave a sidewalk with a width of 9 feet 6 inches which should be more than adequate. He believed that the setback had originally been established in an effort to enhance and beautify the neighborhood. Initially, the setback area had been landscaped; however, because of the difficulty which had been experienced in maintaining the landscaping, the setback area had finally been covered with cement. He believed that removal of the setback would act as a buffer for the residential properties along Pierce Street from the commercial activities on Chestnut Street; and he felt that construction of the new bank building in the setback area would reduce the wind-tunnel effect along Pierce Street and allow owners of residential properties along that street to plant street trees in front of their houses. Furthermore, retention of the florist stand would maintain continuity with the past and would be an asset to the area.

Mr. Clark stated that he had submitted renderings of the proposed bank building to the staff of the Department of City Planning; and, at the suggestion of the staff of the Department of City Planning, he had contacted Miss Virginia Fusco, Secretary of the Marina Civic Improvement and Property Owners Association, Inc., requesting an opportunity to discuss his application at the next meeting of her association. He had not received an invitation to their meeting. In conclusion, he advised the Commission that the Marina Merchants Association was not opposed to the application.

Commissioner Finn asked what would happen to the florist shop if the setback were not removed. Mr. Clark replied that the florist shop could not be accommodated on the site unless the setback were removed. In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Finn, Mr. Clark stated that plans for construction of the bank would not be affected if the Commission were to disapprove the request for removal of the setback.



Commissioner Fleishhacker asked about the size of the site which would be made available to the florist shop if the set back were to be removed. Mr. Clark replied that a parcel with a width of 7 feet and a depth of 55 feet would be available for the florist shop. In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. Clark stated that the florist actually needs only 120 square feet for his operation.

Morris Phia, manager of the florist shop, stated that his family had operated the shop for approximately 40 years; and he indicated that he would like to continue his operation in the area. If removal of the setback were not to be approved by the Commission, he hoped that he would be given permission to place a kiosk in the setback area on Pierce Street for the sale of flowers. In a question raised by President Newman, Mr. Phia stated that he would like to get as long a lease as possible on the property if the setback were to be removed.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the subject application.

Jeanne Caire, a member of the Board of Directors of the Marina Civic Improvement and Property Owners Association, Inc., read and submitted a letter which stated that the Board of Directors of that organization had voted unanimously on Wednesday, August 25, 1971, to oppose the subject application and to oppose any change in the existing setback lines on Pierce Street or in the subject block.

Virginia Fusco, Secretary of the Marina Civic Improvement and Property Owners Association, stated that she had given her time and the courtesy of her home to Mr. Clark; and, in trying to pin him down as to what he wanted, she had determined that sufficient buildable area is already available for the bank. The removal of the setback was being requested only to accommodate the florist shop. Yet, in walking on Chestnut Street, she had seen a sign in another building next to the real estate office announcing that that building would be the future home of the florist shop. She submitted several photographs which she had taken of the subject property and of the sidewalk along Pierce Street, noting how construction of a building on the corner would affect the area. She stated that the homeowners on Pierce Street, all of whom are good Americans, had significantly improved the appearance of the street during the past ten years; and she indicated that the street trees which had previously existed along the sidewalk had been removed because of damage done by dogs and not because of any wind problems as had been suggested by Mr. Clark. She stated that she has lived in the Marina District since 1926; and she remarked that Mr. Clark's family had never spent a cent to improve their property. Furthermore, when residents of the neighborhood had urged the removal of a billboard located on the rear portion of the property, Mr. Clark had not been willing to cooperate. She indicated that the neighborhood already has enough banks to serve its needs; and, therefore, she did not feel that the neighborhood should have to make any concessions to attract a new bank to the area. Finally, Miss Fusco remarked that the problem of the florist shop could be resolved by the owner of the property without the removal of the seven foot setback if he so desired; and she repeated the recommendation of her Board of Directors that the request for removal of the setback be disapproved.



Commissioner Finn asked if it were true that plans had already been made to relocate the florist shop to another site. Mr. Phia replied that he had made arrangements for temporary quarters in a building located at 1295 Chestnut Street; however, since the property has been sold to a restaurant chain, he will not be able to remain in the building for a long period of time.

Miss Fusco remarked that it should not be difficult for Mr. Phia to find another location on the street for the florist shop.

Mr. Bolini, representing the owner of property located at 3315 Pierce Street, felt that removal of the setback would substantially reduce the value of his client's property and that it would destroy the symmetry and alignment of Pierce Street. Furthermore, approval of the applicant's request would establish a precedent which might result in similar requests in the future.

An attorney for the estate of Angelo Scafidi, owner of property located at 38 Avila Street, asked that the record reflect his opposition to the applicant's proposal for removal of the setback on Pierce Street.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He noted that the setback which presently exists along the full length of the subject block of Pierce Street gives residents of the street a sense of openness which would be destroyed if the setback were to be abolished; and he noted that guidelines contained in the Urban Design element of the Master Plan recommended that street facade lines and traditional street spaces should be maintained. He also remarked that no public need for removal of the setback had been demonstrated by the applicant. If the applicant had been deeply concerned about the fate of the florist shop, he could have made some provision for retention of the shop in the lease which he had negotiated with the Security Pacific Bank. However, he did not feel that the solution which was now being proposed, which would involve squeezing the florist shop into a seven-foot space between two large buildings, would be acceptable. In conclusion, he remarked that the florist might wish to investigate the possibility of obtaining permission for placement of a kiosk in the setback area; however, he indicated that such permits are not handled by the Department of City Planning.

Mr. Clark stated that a request would be filed for permission to place a kiosk in the setback area.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Rueda and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Commission does sympathize with small businessman who are forced to move; however, she pointed out that abolition of the setback line on the subject property would depreciate the value of all of the other properties in the block.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6753 and to disapprove the subject application.



## CU69.12 - Pacific Medical Center

Request for approval of Master Plan for expansion of the Medical

Center.

(Postponed from meetings of June 3 and July 1, 1971).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the Pacific Medical Center had requested modification of a Master Plan which had been authorized by the City Planning Commission in 1963. The original Master Plan had been prepared by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; and the plan presently under consideration had been prepared by Stone, Marachini & Patterson. Plans for the proposed office building had been prepared by Roger Boyer. Mr. Steele remarked that the requested modification of the Master Plan had initially been submitted to the City Planning Commission early in 1969 along with final plans for the first phase of a new hospital building. At that time, the City Planning Commission had found the newly proposed Master Plan to be unacceptable. However, it did authorize construction of a three-hundred eleven bed hospital building and a three-hundred ninety-five car garage at Webster and Clay Streets. The hospital building is now under construction; and the garage has been completed. The resolution by which the Commission had approved the hospital and the parking garage had stated that no additional buildings would be approved for the Medical Center until an appropriate Master Plan for expansion of the Medical Center has been approved by the City Planning Commission. Preliminary design terms of reference were recommended to the Medical Center by the staff of the Department of City Planning at the same time. A revised Master Plan had been filed in April, 1971. And, at the same time, preliminary plans for the first phase of the doctor's office building, the next building contemplated by the Medical Center for construction, were submitted. Since April, additional meetings had been held between the hospital, the staff of the Department of City Planning, and representatives of the neighborhood, with revisions being made to the Master Plan in response to neighborhood and staff concern. Additionally, as a result of a request from the neighborhood, the Department arranged to have a traffic analysis of the proposal prepared. This analysis was submitted to the Department on August 23, 1971, and had been reviewed in detail by the staff of the Department of City Planning as well as by the Bureau of Engineering.

Mr. Steele continued with his presentation as follows:

"The present Pacific Medical Center consists basically of a 250-bed hospital, research and teaching facilities, dental school and medical library. The dental school, research building at Clay and Webster Streets were authorized under the 1963 Master Plan. The concept of the 311-bed hospital now under construction was also authorized in the 1963 Master Plan which contemplated a total of 518 beds for the Medical Center.

"The new Master Plan proposes a total of 500 beds, and an overall program similar to that proposed in the 1963 Master Plan.



"Since the April filing of the Master Plan the Commission has adopted an Urban Design element of the Master Plan and has initiated formal consideration of height and bulk limit districts. The present Master Plan proposal as shown in the model and drawings submitted to the Commission is within maximum height of 160 feet for which consideration has been initiated except for the most westerly proposed building. This building exceeds 160 feet and may not be authorized by the Commission unless reduced in size.

"On an overall site basis the proposed building area is within floor area ratio limitations of the R-4 district in which the Center is located.

"The applicant should now describe in detail the proposed master plan and medical office and clinic building.

Clifford Schwarberg, President of the Pacific Medical Center, displayed and described a model and isometric drawings of the proposed expansion of the Medical Center. He stated that consideration had been given to the height of the buildings being proposed, setbacks, and provision of plazas and open spaces which would enhance the neighborhood; and he pointed out that the Doctor's office building which was being proposed would be set back from adjacent residential properties in order to lessen the impact of the use. He stated that he was aware of a certain amount of neighborhood concern with regard to traffic and access to the parking garage which would serve the office building; and he remarked that the parking garage would be designed so that it would increase the number of parking spaces from 150 to 200 in the future in accordance with the need determined by the recent traffic study.

Commissioner Rueda asked for an indication of the time schedule to be followed by the Medical Center in implementing the Master Plan. Mr. Schwarberg replied that Phase I of the development program would be initiated immediately following approval of the Master Plan by the City Planning Commission with completion scheduled for 1973. The other phases of the program would depend upon financing and the availability of state funding programs; however, it was conceivable that they, also, could be completed within three to five years.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that the members of the Commission had received a letter from John Lewis Field, which contained the following statement: "There is virtually no open space in the plan except Clay Street. If the property had been developed in smaller parcels, there would have been open space at ground level, more variety of street fronts and generally more human scale. This project's plazas occur at the sixth floor!"

He asked Mr. Schwarberg to describe the plaza areas and their relationship to each other; and Mr. Schwarberg proceeded to describe the phases in which a series of plazas would be developed in the former right-of-way of Clay Street. Commissioner Ritchie then remarked that the westernmost building shown on the



model seemed to be higher than the other buildings depicted; and, if so, he pointed out that the building would not honor the existing hill form of the area. Mr. Schwarberg replied that the building which had been proposed would exceed by twenty feet the height limit recommended for the subject property in the Urban Design Plan.

President Newman, also, quoted from the letter which had been submitted by Mr. Field as follows: "Setbacks from the sidewalks are desirable, but the cantilevers on upper stories back over the ground level setbacks emphasize the size of the hospital buildings and destroy any chance for the survival of the scale of the neighborhood. This kind of brutal architectural expression must be prohibited".

Mr. Schwarberg felt that Mr. Field must have been referring to the hospital building which is already presently under construction.

The Director remarked that the consultants who had prepared the traffic analysis of the proposed master plan had made several suggestions which had not yet been reflected in the plans. Those suggestions had related to access and egress, provision of approximately 300 more parking spaces than had been proposed, providing an additional exit from the main parking structure onto Sacramento Street, creation of a processing lane and installation of control gates, and recommendations for programs under which the parking spaces would be rented at reduced rates to employees, faculty members and students. He asked Mr. Schwarberg if he had had an opportunity to respond to those suggestions.

Mr. Schwarberg stated that the Medical Center would be prepared to follow the recommendations of the Department of Public Works regarding access and egress to the parking garage on Sacramento Street. Initially, the Medical Center felt that such traffic on Sacramento Street would be a hazard; however, based on the recommendations of the Department of Public Works, they would be willing to give further consideration to the proposal. The Pacific Medical Center was also in agreement with the proposal to install control gates in the parking garage. And, in addition, they were in agreement with the recommendations concerning Webster and Buchanan Streets. At the present time, a reduced rate for parking is being offered to employees of the Medical Center; however, no validations are made for students or visitors to the facility. Nevertheless, the Medical Center would be willing to investigate the feasibility of reducing rates for visitors and students; and, at the same time, an alternate recommendation proposed by the consultants involving rapid transit subsidies for employees and students could be investigated. In fact, he felt that such subsidies should probably be considered by all hospitals in San Francisco.

William H. Gilmartin, 2224 Clay Street, read the following statement:

"Two years ago we appeared before you and asked that Pacific Medical Center's Plan to build a massive hospital structure across Clay Street be rejected. We said then and say now, that in 1962 the Neighborhood did not oppose the closing of Clay Street with a Hospital Building. But it was a true 6 story building some 70 feet high, well set back from Buchanan Street and surrounded by malls.



"Our recommendation to you in 1969 was not approved. We now have 6 story double floored building some 135 feet high with no surrounding malls. The neighborhood has been damaged by this structure, which you all have seen.

"We feel that, in planning the remainder of this project, a balance can be reached between Hospital needs and Neighborhood values. Neighborhood values includes such things such as:

Air space - Open feeling - good traffic flow and controlled Bulk and Density.

"The new Hospital represents an abrupt and blighting transition to Neighborhood. The proposed Office Building through the efforts of Commission - Staff - PMC and their architects achieves a balance. The matter of traffic to this structure will be covered later.

"Looking to the future I see a series of high-rise buildings with little open space at ground level - open space will be gardens on building tops. Considerable progress has been made with Mr. Sachaweben, Dr. Gamble, Mrs. Early in the reduction of height and bulk of Building B at Webster and Sacramento. This height has been reduced from 280 to 170 feet. But this removed bulk has been shifted to other locations, namely to the site of the present garage on vacant land proposed for purchase just West of the Garage and Dental building.

"The building proposed for this area, Clay near Fillmore, seems to be well over 200 feet high - far beyond limits set by the Urban Design Plan.

"In my judgment the long range square foot requirements of PMC approximate those of U.C. at Parnassus Heights. U.C. backs into the hills but even so the neighbors are currently concerned with traffic flow and further encroachment of U.C. buildings into their residential area.

"The long range space needs of PMC cannot be met on their present land Area, without further damage to the Neighborhood. What PMC needs is more land area. Speaking of land Area, Franklin Hospital designed by Stcne Marachini and Patterson is an excellent example of adequate land, coupled with sensitive design, and concern with Traffic flow to the end that the neighbors regard it as a pleasant addition.

'My recommendations to prevent further neighborhood blight are:

1. Freeze the new hospital building (H-1) at its present height.



2. Future hospital building (H-2) not to exceed the height of frozen (H-1).
3. The newly adopted Urban Design Plan criteria be used in all future additions.
4. That all the property lying between the East side of Fillmore and the West side of the garage and Dental School, between Clay and Sacramento, be purchased. It would give Fillmore a much needed asset
5. That a further review of Traffic be made to reflect the proposals made earlier and agreement reached with the help of Mr. Jacobs as to the method of traffic flow most equitable to the overall neighborhood.

"With respect to Recommendation No. 4, purchase of additional land some may say that this will take time and be difficult to accomplish. It seems to me that since it was possible to acquire Clay Street for building purposes it is certainly feasible to acquire this land. And there will be plenty of time as the total Master Plan will take many years to realize.

"In conclusion I recommend that the meeting of these five points be made a condition of Master Plan approval. Master Plan approval to me means that the Plan is approved in principle as to parameters, then that the broad design of each structure be revised by all Concerned before any detail work is started. Purchase of additional land as outlined above and review of all tentative plans is the way to keep PMC future expansion in some reasonable scale with their surroundings."

Commissioner Porter remarked that she had been quite concerned about the effect which the proposed office building might have on adjacent residential properties; and she wondered if the changes which had been proposed by the Medical Center had made the building acceptable to adjacent property owners. Mr. Gilmartin replied in the affirmative but emphasized that the acceptability of the building would be contingent upon Mr. Schwarberg's offer to landscape the rear of the building. Some concern was still felt about the entrance which was being proposed to the office building. However, he felt that issues of that sort could be resolved by the Department of City Planning in the best interests of all concerned parties.

Edgar S. Bissinger, President of the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council, remarked that the recently adopted Urban Design Plan had contained principles calling for the preservation of established residential areas and specifying that the design of new buildings should respect the character of older near-by developments; and he felt that the height, bulk, and density of the buildings proposed by the Pacific Medical Center should be reduced to conform to those principles. Especially he felt that acquisition of additional lots near the proposed westerly tower should



be a prerequisite for approval of the Master Plan. Furthermore, since traffic congestion could seriously endanger the neighborhood, he felt that access to the proposed garage should be obtained from Webster and Clay Streets rather than from Buchanan Street. In conclusion, he asked residents of the subject neighborhood who were present in the audience to rise and state their names for the record. Approximately 16 individuals stood and stated their names and addresses; and several of them expressed concern about traffic congestion in the area and suggested that there should be no entrance to the garage from Buchanan Street.

Warren Wilson, representing the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council, read and submitted the following statement:

"With the initial introduction of Pacific Medical Center's master-plan some four years ago, our neighborhood was heartened to find that the old, deteriorating hospital buildings were to be replaced with a new complex of buildings. Each passing year, and each succeeding masterplan revision for the Center has made us aware of problems which would have an even greater impact on our neighborhood than the present deteriorating buildings. This tremendous development has already disrupted our skyline, changed traffic patterns, and increased the traffic flow on our streets. With the vacation of Clay Street and the loss of air rights above that street we have lost a considerable amount of open space and stand to lose a great deal more as each successive building in the Center becomes a reality. The density of the buildings and the number of people in the area will no doubt further congest our streets with illegally parked cars and pollute our environment with a fantastic level of noise, litter, and exhaust fumes.

"Lest you think we are in opposition to the Medical Center and its dedication to healing and teaching, let us hasten to say we strongly believe in the importance of excellent medical care for all people, and a teaching environment which will do its part to alleviate our chronic shortage of doctors.

"However, we are in direct opposition to the denial of our rights as property owners and taxpayers by a hospital, or any other entity that seeks to change our environment for the worse. We strongly believe our rights can be respected without any adverse effect on the masterplan of the Pacific Medical Center.

"To this end we would like to set forth, for the record, what we desire as a neighborhood in hopes of reaching a satisfactory compromise with the Pacific Medical Center.

"The sale of Clay Street, and the subsequent construction of the hospital across Clay Street at Buchanan made us painfully aware of what we had already lost in terms of open space and access. Our concern at that point, was to salvage the remainder of Clay Street and protect it



as open space with trees, walkways, and benches for pedestrian use. This would still be desirable if it were not for other considerations which are of more importance to the life and future life of our area than is a pedestrian mall.

"As the impact of the Medical Center becomes more apparent with each day's construction, we are desparately concerned about the one element that will ruin our neighborhood faster than the lack of open space or the lack of adequate landscaping and maintenance. That one element is: Uncontrolled flow of traffic through our neighborhood.

"When in July it became apparent this element had not been considered in depth, the planning staff and the neighborhood requested that Pacific Medical Center commission a traffic study. This study, in a preliminary form, was completed August 25, six days ago. We have not had the opportunity to evaluate this study, but more important, we submit that the planners for the Center have not had the time to modify a masterplan which was two years in preparation. Traffic is of a major concern to our neighborhood, and quite simply, neither alternatives, nor time for study of these alternatives have been offered by Pacific Medical Center.

"The neighborhood feels strongly that the hospital should study and discuss with the neighborhood the following suggestions.

"If we are to preserve our family-oriented neighborhood, traffic to and from the hospital complex must be routed through commercial streets, or those with a provision for moving traffic quickly, ie: one way streets. For the movement of East/West traffic we urge the use of Sacramento, California, Pine and Bush Streets. And for North/South movement Fillmore Street.

"We visualize Fillmore Street becoming a street much like Polk Street. There should be loading zones in each block to lessen the occurrence of double parked delivery trucks. There should be traffic signals where necessary to control the flow of cars in a constant, orderly manner.

"The primary parking access for the Medical Center should be on Sacramento and on Webster (south of Clay). In other words, personnel, patients, doctors, and visitors intending to park for any visit to any Medical Center building should find an entrance on Sacramento or one on Webster opposite the Dental School. Temporarily, the office building might have both ingress and egress on the section of Clay between Buchanan and Webster owned by Pacific Medical Center. This plan should also be accompanied by suitable controlled turning at the intersections of Webster and Clay, Fillmore and Clay, Sacramento and Webster, and perhaps Sacramento and Buchanan.



September 2, 1971

"The Smith traffic study considers only one possibility for parking entrances and exits. We would like to see predictable results of several different alternatives. First should be entrances and exits on Sacramento (two lanes each way). Another might be to have them on Clay, even though that would eat into the mall area. Then the choice least disruptive to the neighborhood could be made intelligently.

"It is estimated that 51% of the traffic to the Medical Center will come from the South. Webster will obviously be the route chosen unless an alternative is provided. That alternative should be Fillmore. Increased traffic on Fillmore could only signal an increase in business for the commercial interests on that street. But increased traffic on Buchanan, Washington, Webster, and Clay (above Buchanan) can only signal the sure decline in the quality of life for residents on those streets.

"By placing the burden of traffic and parking on hospital property our residential neighborhood would not be destroyed by uncontrolled traffic, or one-way streets, or illegally parked cars, and a 24-hour public garage.

"In closing, let it be clear that for the most part we do not object to the architectural elements of the Medical Center. Instead, it is the density of buildings to which we object. And the absence of a commitment by Pacific Medical Center to landscaping their property imaginatively and extensively.

"We strongly urge Pacific Medical Center to provide us, and indeed their own employees, patients, and visitors with aesthetically pleasing facades, including planters, benches, trees, and flowers at every possible sidewalk, entrance and terrace. We can imagine the 36 foot-wide area between the Proposed Doctor's Office Building and the Washington Street Residents' property line being made into a pocket park: a small area of concentrated greenery in an otherwise concrete block.

"With imagination and environmental concern, Pacific Medical Center could provide its immediate neighbors, and indeed, our City with an example of how a development of such magnitude can be an asset to a neighborhood. We would like to be able to point with pride at Pacific Medical Center for having recognized its obligation to reflect the needs of its neighbors.

"We can only hope that you members of the City Planning Commission will be ever mindful of how the newly adopted Urban Design principles can be applied to this masterplan, which affects our lives so critically."

Commissioner Porter assured Mr. Wilson that no member of the City Planning Commission would approve any development proposal for a Pacific Medical Center which would not be in conformity with the Urban Design Plan which was only recently adopted as part of the City's Master Plan.



Mrs. William A. Murphy, 2255 Washington Street, stated that she was firmly opposed to construction of a doctor's office building on the particular site which had been chosen by the Pacific Medical Center; and she felt that it was incredible that the Medical Center should propose to construct such a building at very little cost to the doctors on tax-exempt land. At the very least, she felt that the office building should be purchased by the doctors so that it could be returned to the tax rolls.

George Tsang, Assistant Engineer for the Department of Public Works, stated that he had reviewed the traffic data and recommendations which had been provided by Wilber Smith and Associates; and he indicated that he agreed with the recommendation for 1500 parking stalls and thought that they should be provided by the Medical Center. He stated that he intended to meet further with the Medical Center and with the staff of the Department of City Planning to resolve certain access and egress problems which had not yet been solved.

Commissioner Finn asked if 1500 parking spaces would be sufficient to serve the entire staff of the Medical Center, visitors, out-patients, and students. Mr. Tsang replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Schwarberg pointed out that a representative of Wilber Smith and Associates was in the audience if the Commission wished to raise any questions regarding the traffic survey.

Eugene Cox, 2319 Washington Street, stated that he had been asked to read the letter which had been mailed to members of the Commission by John Lewis Field; however, since individual members of the Commission had already raised questions regarding the issues pointed out in Mr. Field's letter, he did not feel that it would be necessary to read the letter again. He complimented the Commission for adopting the Urban Design Plan as a part of the city's Master Plan; and he indicated that he respected Mr. Gilmartin's cooperative approach to the Pacific Medical Center. However, if the driveway to the medical office building were to be constructed as proposed in the plans which had been prepared for the Medical Center, his property and properties owned by three other individuals on Washington Street would be affected in an extremely detrimental manner.

Richard Darlinghouse, 2310 Buchanan Street, sympathized with the concerns which had been expressed by Mr. Cox and pointed out that the report which had been prepared by the traffic consultants had indicated that the proposed medical office building would increase the volume of traffic on residential streets in the area by 70 or 75 percent.

Mrs. King, owner of property located on the southeast corner of Buchanan and Washington Streets, felt that the 30-foot ramp leading to the parking garage which would be constructed for the office building should be landscaped to reduce its impact on the adjacent residential properties. Furthermore, she had been advised by professional engineers that it would be feasible to provide an entrance to the garage from Webster Street and the vacated portion of Clay Street rather than from Buchanan Street.



September 2, 1971

Mrs. Arthur J. Bloomfield, 2229 Webster Street, submitted and summarized the following prepared statement:

"First, I want to call your attention to the overall bulk proposed by PMC. What I perceive in their plans is not at all a replacement of obsolete buildings, but a new and gigantic mass. A whole new empire, where none was before. The new hospital I can understand, and the new office building (a great convenience and tax shelter for the doctors). But here in addition are four entirely new high-rises, all in a block and a half, giving very roughly 275,000 square feet, to be 'medical facilities'. Even with the explanation, 'Related to health care, such as classrooms, laboratories, and related institutes,' I don't understand at all what is proposed or why so much of it is proposed. That's an awful lot of space to be so vague about, not to mention the money. Two hundred seventy-five thousand square feet could make 250 classrooms, with corridors etc. Or perhaps 250 labs and classrooms together. Pretty handsome for the 350 medical students PMC apparently wishes. One and a half students per room? Ten staff and employees per student? As I said, it seem like an empire, or perhaps like the bulk of the U.C.-S.F. campus squeezed into less than three square blocks.

"This is new. One high-rise hospital, going up now, its equally high addition. One high office building and its addition. One high-rise Dental School already in operation. One medium-size garage, now used, large from the pedestrian's point of view. Four 'Medical facility' towers. That makes ten huge buildings, an immense and incalculable change in the neighborhood, which has been pretty heavily residential.

"Do we really want it? Is the gain of a new medical school--and I know many more doctors are needed--worth the price of this much change in this place? Do they have enough land? Do you want to allow citizens of San Francisco to pay this price for that gain?

"Please consider very carefully whether or not you want to allow this new and somewhat vague development. It really alarms me.

"Now I'd like to speak about specific aspects of the plan before you. Subject: traffic, particularly parking entrances and exits. I cannot visualize an eventual 4,500 people parking and entering the Center each day. But those who can seem to recommend four entrance lanes to and four exit lanes from the proposed main block underground parking. The PMC maps show one entrance-and-exit---I presume four lanes of each---on Webster Street opposite the Dental School entrance. That doesn't make me happy; it's barely a block from my front door, and next to me and on the corner live two children under 2 whose parents bought these properties in the last year and are concerned about the traffic at their doors. But at least that access is on a block owned on both sides by PMC.



"The other four lanes of entrance-and-exit are in question. I feel very strongly that they should be on Sacramento, opposite PMC property. Sacramento already has very heavy traffic, and a little more won't change its quality. But other streets around the main block would be much changed by additional traffic their residential quality would be hurt.

"As an interim measure, while only the new hospital and office building exist, parking entrance-and-exit could be up Clay Street. Again, only on PMC land, getting the traffic away from the neighbors. No exit Research Building.

"It seems to me that not all the parking needs to be open all the time. I would like to see you stipulate, as one of the conditions of the conditional use, if you grant it, that some of the parking with its access be closed nights and weekends. Both for safety and for traffic control.

"Finally, I urge you to put this matter over. If parking access is to be changed, the planners need more time. Most of all, I'd like you to take your time deciding whether all these new high-rises shall or shall not be allowed."

The Director stated that he was not prepared to make a recommendation on the Medical Center's Master Plan during the present hearing; and he recommended that the matter be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on September 30. During the interim, the staff of the Department of City Planning would review in detail all of the material which had been submitted, would consider the testimony which had been submitted by speakers during the public hearing, and would prepare a recommendation for consideration by the Commission. If the Commission so desired, the staff could make its recommendation available to the general public prior to the meeting on September 30 so that interested persons could review it prior to the meeting. The Director remarked that all parties involved had made a serious effort to meet and overcome all of the valid concerns which had been expressed; yet, while the architect for the Medical Center had made a major effort to meet the concerns which had been expressed by the community, he felt that it was still probable that not all of the conflicting concerns of the hospital and of the community could be resolved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn and seconded by Commissioner Rueda that the subject application be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting on September 30, 1971, at 3:00 p.m.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if it would be possible for the Commission to separate the medical office building from the remainder of the Master Plan so that the Medical Center would be free to proceed with construction of that particular building; in the meantime, he felt that the Commission would benefit from additional time to review the overall Master Plan which may not become a reality for 25 or 50



September 2, 1971

years. Personally, he felt that the Master Plan contained too much floor space for the subject site; and he felt that either the scope of the project should be reduced or that additional land should be acquired.

The Director agreed that the density of the proposed plan seemed to be too great for the site; however, since individual elements of the Master Plan would ultimately be linked together in tightly knit fashion, he would be reluctant to separate the medical office building from the remainder of the plan for piece-meal action by the Commission.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the Pacific Medical Center is entitled to use the power of eminent domain. Mr. Schwarberg replied that the Medical Center is allowed to use such powers only in specific and rare circumstances.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to take the matter under advisement until the meeting of September 30, 1971, at 3:00 p.m. President Newman requested that the Director not make his recommendation on the matter public before the next meeting.

#### CURRENT MATTERS CONTINUED

The Director advised the Commission that the Zoning Administrator had established the time and place for the Commission's first public hearing on height reclassifications for February 24, 1972, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

The Director reminded the Commission that its regular meeting next Thursday, September 9, will be cancelled in observance of Admission Day, a legal holiday.

After discussion, the Commission requested the Director to investigate and report at the next Commission meeting on the subject of the Russian Consulate's proposal to use a residentially zoned building on the northwest corner of Green and Baker Streets for office purposes.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of August 5, 1971, be approved as submitted.

R70.62 - Sale of Property, Dwight and Goettingen Streets, Lot 39, Block 6117 and Lot 11, Block 6118.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), reported on this matter as follows:



"Lot 39, Block 6117 and Lot 11, Block 6118 are adjacent vacant City-owned properties which together make a parcel 100 feet deep and 270 feet long on the steep hillside northeast of Woodrow Wilson High School in the McLaren Park-Portola area. There is a substantial amount of vacant property in the area, located along Dwight Street and Karen Court, a new street which was created in conjunction with the vacating of portions of Somerset and Holyoke Streets to provide access to the hillside. Dwight Street was improved in 1969, and since the City Property has 270 feet of frontage on Dwight its attractiveness as a building site is greatly enhanced.

"Lot 11 was within the original (1926) boundaries of John McLaren Park and is under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department. Lot 39 was formerly a portion of Somerset Street which was vacated in 1966 and became City property because it abutted Lot 11.

"The person who requested the sale of Lots 11 and 39 is one of several owners of the other vacant properties in the area. His objective is to obtain enough land for a planned unit development. The properties were the subject of an application for rezoning from R-1 to R-2, ZM69.22, which was disapproved by the City Planning Commission in October 1969, the disapproval being subsequently sustained by the Board of Supervisors. City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6431 noted that neither a sufficient public need for a higher residential density in the subject area, nor the compatibility of a higher density development with the surrounding area, had been demonstrated.

"Neither the San Francisco Unified School District nor the Recreation and Park Department has expressed an interest in the property; however, staff members of the Housing Authority have expressed an interest. The site would be desirable for scattered public housing."

The Director recommended that the sale of the subject properties be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the Housing Authority is offered an opportunity to negotiate for the site before it is put up for sale at auction.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the sale of Lot 39, Block 6117 and Lot 11, Block 6118 at the northwest corner of Dwight and Goettingen Street is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the Housing Authority is offered an opportunity to negotiate for the site before it is put up for sale at auction.

At 5:40 p.m. it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the meeting be adjourned out of respect of the memory of M. Justin Herman.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



DIRECTOR'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, September 16, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 16, 1971, at 2:00 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

Present: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker; Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

Absent: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; William Proctor, Planner IV; Beatrice Ryan, Planner III; James Paul, Planner III; Walter Stoll, Planner III - Transportation; John Sanger, Planner II; William Duchek, Planner II; James White, Planner II; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of August 12 and 19, 1971, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

President Newman informed the Commission that a meeting with the City Planning Sub-Committee of the Grand Jury has been scheduled for Thursday, September 30, at 1:30 p.m.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, requested the Plan Implementation Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Porter) to meet next Thursday, September 23, at 1:30 p.m.

The Director reminded the Commission of the Zoning Field Trip scheduled for 1:00 p.m. next Thursday, September 23. The Regular Meeting will begin at 2:15 p.m.

The Director advised the Commission that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board will hold a public meeting next Wednesday, September 22 at 2:30 p.m. to receive comments on the proposed creation of a Jackson Square Historic District.



Commissioner Fleishhacker and the Director reported on work accomplished to date by the Joint City Planning Commission and Port Commission Committee which was formed to prepare a Composite Report on the Waterfront in response to a request from the Board of Supervisors. The Director stated that a map showing all known proposals for the Waterfront will be on display in the main hallway at 100 Larkin Street for one month beginning on Tuesday, September 21.

In response to a request made by the Commission at its last meeting, the Director reported on the current status of the Russian Consulate's proposal to use a residentially zoned building on the northwest corner of Green and Baker Streets for office purposes. Offices are not ordinarily permitted in R-2 districts except in a very restricted fashion as on accessory use; and the City Attorney had informed the Department of City Planning that the Russian Consulate has not received any State Department exemptions from the City Planning Code. As a result, a letter had been written to the Russian Consul requesting that he meet with the staff of the Department of City Planning to discuss the conformity or non-conformity of the proposed use with applicable provisions of the City Planning Code. Commissioner Ritchie requested that the City Attorney be asked to send a letter to the State Department advising them of San Francisco's R-2 zoning standards and asking that those standards be observed by foreign consulates.

The Director read the following statement:

"The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has informed us that they are unable to approve our 1970-71 application for grant assistance under the Urban Beautification Program. The reason given for the disapproval was that changes in our accounting and operational procedures required by the Department of Housing and Urban Development could not be implemented in time for the new program.

"While this decision was a disappointment, we had been successful in obtaining approval on three previous urban beautification applications. Grants awarded from these previous programs have totaled approximately \$1.5 million. These funds have been reinvested to further our Urban Beautification Program. We can, therefore, take considerable pride in what has actually been accomplished with our program.

"Beginning in July, a new program called 'Legacy of Parks' was initiated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It combines the open space, historic preservation and urban beautification programs into a single program. Grants under this new program will generally be made on a 50-50 matching basis. This ratio will be more favorable to the City than was the previous method of grant allocation under the Urban Beautification Program.



"On May 21, 1971, a letter was submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development setting forth our intent to file for grant assistance under the Legacy of Parks Program. We are now in the process of re-evaluating this letter to reflect program changes resulting from the disapproval of our 1970-71 Urban Beautification application and changes being made in the Mini-park Program. Once these determinations are made, we will proceed to amend the letter of intent which will be the basis for filing an application for grant assistance to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Legacy of Parks program."

R71.40 - Revocable encroachment permit for Church building in sidewalk area, 422 Leland Avenue between Elliot and Sawyer Streets.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The American Indian Baptist Church, with numerous members of its congregation living in Visitacion Valley, undertook to construct a church building on a do-it-yourself basis on Leland Avenue, an area zoned R-1 and developed with single family houses. The building permit application was approved by all applicable City departments, concrete for the foundations was poured and walls were partially erected when the City received a complaint that the building was encroaching 14 feet into the 20-foot wide sidewalk. The City thereupon stopped construction, and the church applied to the Board of Supervisors for a revocable encroachment permit, since relocating the foundations might double the original estimated cost of the building, \$54,000.

"The total right-of-way width of Leland Avenue is 60 feet. West of Delta Street, the official sidewalk widths are 10 feet on the south side of the street and 20 feet on the north, with the actual sidewalks constructed at 6 feet wide. The extra width on the north is used for gardens or driveways and has such usual encroachments as stairways and low walls. There are also four or five residential garages, probably built in an earlier era, encroaching in the sidewalk area.

"The Urban Design Plan establishes policies regarding release of street areas by the City for private use. Conservation Policy 9 on street space states that no release of a street area should be recommended which would result in elimination of open space which might feasibly be used for public landscaping, or which would result in detriment to the scale and character of surrounding development. Neighborhood Environment Policy 15 on visual amenity refers to maintaining established building lines.

"Because the church building is placed only 6 feet from the curb, there is no room left for any foundation plantings and the effect is quite abrupt, especially since many of the houses use the extra sidewalk area for planting.



SEPTEMBER 16, 1971

"Although City departments approved the church's plans, the permit was approved in error and is not valid. Unless the Board of Supervisors sees fit to grant the encroachment permit, the church will have to be constructed within the property lines."

The Director remarked that it was obvious that someone had obviously made a mistake which had resulted in the church being constructed in the sidewalk area. While he assumed that the mistake had been made inadvertently, and while he recognized that certain hardships might be faced by the church if the revocable encroachment permit were not approved, he was of the opinion that it would be impossible for the staff of the Department of City Planning to find the encroachment in the sidewalk area to be in conformity with the Master Plan. Therefore, he recommended that the proposal to encroach 14 feet into the sidewalk area at 422 Leland Avenue be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan. He noted, however, that the recommendation of the City Planning Commission would be advisory in nature and that it would not prohibit the Board of Supervisors from granting the revocable encroachment if that body so desires.

J. Kenneth Lynch, attorney for the American Indian Baptist Church, stated that the building permit for the new church had been approved by all City departments involved in the review process; and, as a result, construction had been initiated on the site. Progress had included excavation, construction of foundations, installation of plumbing and considerable work on the front and rear walls of the building; and then someone had written to the Board of Supervisors complaining about the encroachment into the sidewalk area. He remarked that most of the adjacent property owners have encroachments into the legal but unpaved sidewalk area; and he distributed photographs which he had taken of the street to indicate the extent of existing encroachments. He stated that the congregation of the church has only limited financial resources; and he informed the Commission that the City's refusal to grant the revocable encroachment permit would double the cost of the proposed building which had been estimated at 54,000 dollars.

Mr. Lynch introduced a number of ministers from other Baptist churches in the Bay Area who were present in the audience and indicated that all of them were vitally interested in the project presently under consideration. Since the City had allowed the project to be undertaken, they felt that the revocable encroachment permit should be granted so that the project could be continued to completion. Mr. Lynch indicated that he had received the memo from the staff of the Department of City Planning on the previous Tuesday; and, on noting that the memorandum had contained a negative recommendation, he had asked the minister of the American Indian Baptist Church to find out how other property owners in the area felt about the church building's encroachment into the sidewalk area. A petition which had later been circulated in the neighborhood had been signed by approximately 119 individuals residing in the area; and, in addition, signatures in support of the request for a revocable encroachment had been supported by a number of individuals in the local American Indian community.



President Newman asked if the individuals from the subject neighborhood who had signed the petition favoring granting of the revocable encroachment permit were residents or property owners. Mr. Lynch replied that he believed that most of the people who signed the petition were property owners.

Commissioner Porter remarked that two garages already exist in the sidewalk area; and she wondered if they, also, would have to be relocated if a negative decision were to be made on the church's request for a revocable encroachment permit.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that there are numerous other encroachments into the sidewalk area along the subject block of Leland Avenue; and, while he realized that approval of the revocable encroachment permit might conflict with certain policies stated in the Urban Design Plan which had recently been adopted as an element of the Master Plan by a unanimous vote of the Commission, he felt that the equities involved in the subject case would justify a decision by the Commission approving the request for the revocable encroachment permit. Therefore, he moved that the request for a revocable encroachment permit for the church building be approved.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he had visited the subject neighborhood; and he remarked that the character of the development in the subject block is such that it is impossible to notice that the church is encroaching into the legal sidewalk area. Under the circumstances, he seconded the motion which had been made by Commissioner Mellon.

Commissioner Porter suggested that some action should be taken to legalize other encroachments in the subject block if the subject application were to be approved.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he would be in favor of approving revocable permits for other encroachments in the block; however, since those specific issues were not presently before the Commission for consideration, he suggested that the Commission should proceed to take action on the subject matter without further delay.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he, also, would be in favor of granting the revocable encroachment permit which had been requested by the American Indian Baptist Church; however, he was curious as to whether the church had hired a survey made of the site before construction of the building was initiated. Mr. Lynch replied that he was not aware of any survey having been made; however, the congregation of the church had received professional assistance from an architect, an engineer, and a contractor.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if a title report had been issued which contained a description of the depth of the property. Mr. Lynch replied that he had not been able to gain any significant information from the title report.



The Director remarked that the title report had probably been referred to the "front property line" of the site; and, somewhere along the way, someone had erroneously assumed that the front property line lay adjacent to the paved sidewalk.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if any advantage had been realized from constructing the building on the front portion of the site rather than on the back of the lot. Mr. Lynch replied that more excavation would have been required if the building had been set back further on the property.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the applicant's proposal.

Commissioner Porter stated that she would vote in support of the motion; however, she felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should make an effort to legalize other encroachments in the subject block which are illegal at the present time.

Commissioner Rueda requested that the American Indian Baptist Church work with other property owners in the area to bring order to the development pattern in the subject block.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed revocable encroachment permit for the church building extending 14 feet into the sidewalk area at 422 Leland Avenue as being not in conflict with the Master Plan.

#### Consideration of Guidelines for Redevelopment

President Newman stated that letters had been received from the Downtown Association of San Francisco and from the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce taking the position that future redevelopment activities should not be limited only to low-income housing projects; rather, those organizations felt that redevelopment activities should continue to be aimed at balanced development.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, made the following report to the Commission:

"Since February, when the Plan for Residence was presented to the Commission for adoption, the staff has been working with the Comprehensive Plans Committee on a clarification of the role which redevelopment could play in carrying out the Plan for Residence. During the period when citizens reviewed the Plan for Residence, the desire of neighborhood groups for greater certainty concerning future redevelopment projects became apparent. The staff discovered then, and our area planning staff has subsequently confirmed, that there is much confusion in the neighborhood about what redevelopment



could or would do under the policies of the Plan. In addition the Board of Supervisors has in the past and recently requested the staff to comment on possible redevelopment proposals. In the light of public discussion of proposals for new projects, Mr. Newman on behalf of the Commission forwarded to the Board of Supervisors a letter indicating that the Commission would prepare a statement setting out its position on future redevelopment projects and priorities, in fulfillment of its responsibilities in redevelopment planning. The staff and the committee have prepared a report which suggests guidelines for adoption by the Commission, copies of which were originally mailed to Commission members for their review.

"The report which you have read proposes guidelines by which future redevelopment project proposals should be evaluated and by which priorities among possible redevelopment projects should be established. They are not concerned with existing projects which have been previously approved by the Commission, the Redevelopment Agency and the Board of Supervisors. They are to apply only to future projects which will at various stages of planning come to the Commission for approval or disapproval. They are expected to respond to the need and desire for better understanding of how the Commission would evaluate future project proposals.

"As the report indicates, the Commission is assigned substantial responsibilities by State and local law in the planning and selection of redevelopment projects. The proposed guidelines, if adopted, would clarify in advance the Commission's position on the use of redevelopment to achieve the objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

"As per your instructions at your July 1 meeting, your staff and Redevelopment Agency staff have met again to discuss further changes in the June 2 draft. The Redevelopment Agency staff submitted to us very specific recommendations, a number of which have been included in the draft before you today. At this time I would like to list the major changes made as a result of Redevelopment Agency recommendations:

- 1) p.1 pp2      Added a new paragraph to explain the State Redevelopment Law of 1947.
- 2) p.1 pp3      Included a more extensive excerpt from the Federal Housing Act of 1949.
- 3) p.1 pp4      Added a general description of various Federal housing and urban development programs.



- 4) p.1 pp5      Gave a more detailed description of historical trends in redevelopment.
- 5) p.2 pp3 #2 Added the phrase 'in cooperation with the Redevelopment Agency'.
- 6) p.2 pp3 #4 Added phrase 'in consultation with the Redevelopment Agency'.
- 7) p.4 ppl      Added sentence 'As required by State and Federal laws, all projects in the current redevelopment program conform to the City's Master Plan.'
- 8) p.4 pp2      Included the figures on housing programmed since 1960.
- 9) p.5 pp3      Omitted a considerable amount of wording which dealt with the costs and financing of redevelopment. Removed verbiage that the Redevelopment Agency staff found confusing but kept the point the same. Did not omit entire discussion of financing as suggested by Redevelopment Agency staff.
- 10) p.5 pp4      Added an abbreviated version of a discussion on the method of subsidizing housing proposed by the Redevelopment Agency staff.
- 11) p.7 pp4      Added the Redevelopment Agency work with citizen organizations as an example of community planning which can provide the basis for redevelopment action.

"These are the major changes in the draft since you last reviewed it. The Redevelopment Agency staff recommended additional revisions which would have substantially changed the intent and priorities of the guidelines. We were unable to agree to those revisions.

"Shortly after the Redevelopment Agency staff gave your staff its recommendations, it prepared a report for the Redevelopment Board recommending revisions in the guidelines on September 7. Copies of this report have been distributed to you along with the most recent draft of the guidelines."

"The Department staff feels that the adoption of the proposed guidelines will provide a useful clarification of future redevelopment policy, allowing us to reduce confusion on the part of citizens, local agencies, and the Federal government and to proceed with planning and action for desirable redevelopment projects in the future."



September 16, 1971

"The Commission is asked to endorse the staff and committee report and to adopt a resolution containing the recommended guidelines for future redevelopment projects.

After distributing copies of the draft resolution to the members of the Commission, he recommended its adoption.

Commissioner Porter, noting that this matter had been taken under advisement during the meeting of July 1, 1971, to enable the Director of Planning and the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency to try to come to some agreement regarding the guidelines, asked if there continued to be some disagreement between the two agencies. The Director replied that he continued to feel that future redevelopment projects should be aimed primarily at residential development and that the project areas themselves should be small in size; the Redevelopment Agency continued to have other opinions regarding the future role of redevelopment. In terms of the specific guidelines which were being recommended, No. 1 and 4 seemed to be the ones about which the greatest disagreement exists between the two agencies.

Mr. Fleishhacker requested an explanation of the differences between the two versions of Guideline No. 1, as this had been a major objection to Mr. Herman. The Director said that the Department of City Planning's proposed Guideline No. 1 read: "The major purpose of the potential projects should be construction or rehabilitation of housing for moderate- and low-income families with children, with appropriate supporting residential facilities, in an area suitable for such purpose." The Redevelopment Agency had proposed the following wording: "The major purpose of potential residential projects should be construction or rehabilitation of housing for moderate- and low-income families with children with appropriate supporting residential facilities in areas suitable for such purpose." Although the two alternatives did not appear on the surface to be significantly different, careful analysis would reveal that they were totally different.

The Director explained that the significant difference was that the Department's proposed Guideline states that residential projects should be the major purpose of the redevelopment process; the Redevelopment Agency's wording suggests that residential development would be one of several purposes of the redevelopment process.

For Guideline No. 4, the staff of the Department of City Planning had proposed the following wording: "Potential projects should be small in size and consistent with area scale and character except that larger projects will be appropriate where a non-residential area is converted to a new residential community." The Redevelopment Agency had proposed totally new wording for that guideline, as follows: "Clearance areas in potential neighborhood maintenance projects should be small in size and consistent with the neighborhood scale and character except that larger scale construction would be appropriate where a non-residential area is converted to residential community." In this case, the guideline proposed by the Department of City Planning dealt with the size of all potential redevelopment projects, specifying that they should be small; no reference was made to the desirability or undesirability of clearance as opposed to rehabilitation.



September 16, 1971

The Director also indicated that there was disagreement between the two agencies regarding the wording of guideline No. 5. The staff of the Department of City Planning had proposed the following language: "Redevelopment should be used only where normal private actions cannot be expected to achieve renewal of an area or provide new housing." The Redevelopment Agency recommended that the following language be substituted: "The Redevelopment process should be used only where normal private actions cannot be expected to achieve the City's social, economic and physical objectives within a reasonable time period." Whereas the emphasis of the guideline recommended by the Department of City Planning would be on provision of housing, the language which had been recommended by the Redevelopment Agency would allow renewal resources to be used for a wide range of objectives.

Arthur Evans, Acting Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency, confirmed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had made an effort to accommodate the concerns of the Redevelopment Agency; however, the truth of the matter was that there was a basic difference of opinion between the two agencies regarding the proper function of redevelopment. While the Department of City Planning felt that redevelopment activities should be limited to residential developments for low- and moderate-income families, the Redevelopment Agency felt that redevelopment tools should be used as needed to achieve a wide range of objectives including new parks, better transportation, a broader tax base, jobs, public services, housing for single people, housing for elderly people, and housing for middle income families. The Redevelopment Agency did not feel that funds should result in limitations on the scope of the redevelopment process; rather, it felt that the City should proceed with a balanced redevelopment program and that extra funds should be sought from the Federal government if needed. While the staff of the Department of City Planning felt that greater emphasis should be placed on providing additional housing, Mr. Evans noted that the Redevelopment Agency has already contributed substantially to the City's supply of housing for low- and moderate-income families. Mr. Evans then distributed copies of the report which had been distributed to members of the Commission of the City Planning Commission by the staff of the Department of City Planning with changes, deletions, and inserts which were being recommended by the Redevelopment Agency. In explaining the revisions which were being proposed, he acknowledged that guidelines No. 2 and No. 3, as recommended by the Department of City Planning, were acceptable to the Redevelopment Agency; however, he felt that it was important that guidelines 1, 4, and 5, should be modified as recommended in the materials which he had distributed.

Commissioner Mellon asked Mr. Evans if he felt that involvement of the Redevelopment Agency in new commercial and industrial developments might provide additional resources for the construction of new low- and moderate-income housing. Mr. Evans replied that the constraints involved in the guidelines which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would certainly not make it easier for the Redevelopment Agency to confer in good faith about potential projects which, while not residential in character,



September 16, 1971

might provide credits which could be used for the construction of housing in other areas. Furthermore, while the guidelines would limit the redevelopment process to projects aimed at providing housing for low- and moderate-income families, the Redevelopment Agency felt that there was also a need for providing additional housing for single and elderly people.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the guidelines which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would not have been appropriate in 1951 or in 1961; and he indicated that they might not even be appropriate in 1972. The guidelines being recommended had been designed to meet current objectives; and, as objectives change in the future, the guidelines could be changed, also. The need at the present time is for housing for low- and moderate-income families; and, when that goal is achieved, new priorities could be set in the Commission's guidelines for redevelopment.

Mr. Evans remarked that no expiration date had been established by the staff of the Department of City Planning for the proposed guidelines which, as the staff report had indicated, would be in effect for the "foreseeable future". He felt that the Redevelopment Agency would have embraced the guidelines if they had been proposed five years ago because they actually described the program which has been conducted by the Redevelopment Agency over the past five years; however, he did not feel that the guidelines would be acceptable for the future.

The Director advised the Commission that a considerable number of redevelopment projects had been proposed during the past six months including proposals for most of the northern waterfront and for certain areas south of Market Street; and he felt that guidelines should be established to enable the Commission to evaluate such proposals when they are made in the future. He then offered the following comments:

"On Precluding Projects

"The guidelines are not intended to preclude projects. They were not drafted with any future, undisclosed list of projects in mind.

"Rather the effort is simply to say what the priorities in the immediate future ought to be. The guidelines are the direct result of our work to revise the City's Master Plan; the priorities established in the guidelines are clear: moderate- and low-income housing should be the main priority at this time of the redevelopment program.

"On Hurting the Redevelopment Program

"The guidelines are not a condemnation of the existing redevelopment program. On the contrary, establishing these guidelines should help the redevelopment program by setting forth to the Federal



September 16, 1971

Government as well as the public the clear intentions of the local program. Guidelines should make it clear to the San Francisco citizens that the City will proceed in carrying out through the Redevelopment program established policies of the Master Plan.

"Reasons for Placing Priority on Family Housing

"1. Redevelopment program is the only program that can provide social-economic mixes in housing. It is uniquely qualified to provide moderate-income housing for families.

"2. Family housing requires the most extensive public subsidy -- in contrast to commercial and industrial development.

"3. Embarcadero Center, Yerba Buena and India Basin will provide substantial new space for nonresidential development in the immediate future.

"4. Our assessment of the city's mood after meeting with dozens of groups is that small scale projects for housing are the most acceptable, if not only, approach for redevelopment at this point.

"5. We do not see a change in renewal approach (such as neighborhood maintenance) occurring in the immediate future.

"The facts are these:

"Between 1960 and 1970 San Francisco lost 11,811 families with children. That is a 17.4% drop from the 1960 figure.

"In the last 10 years San Francisco lost, despite its housing programs, 1600 units with 5 rooms or more.

"In the last 10 years the number of units considered over-crowded increased by 9 percent.

"On the Neighborhood Maintenance Concept

"It is our judgment that rehabilitation projects done through redevelopment will be extremely problematical in the near future -- because of a number of factors, including the low vacancy rate and the problem of displacement as a result of such projects. At this time we do not think the City should undertake new redevelopment projects aimed at rehabilitation; rather, it should use redevelopment to increase the supply of housing largely on nonresidential land. The neighborhood maintenance approach can be pursued through code enforcement programs like FACE, through tax incentives and through low-interest rehabilitation loans. Eventually, redevelopment



September 16, 1971

should play a greater role in the maintenance approach, but the critical problem now is to use redevelopment to build new housing on nonresidential land. This short term strategy was outlined in the Housing Programs report published in May. It is consistent with the guidelines and the Plan for Residence.

"On Narrowing the Scope of Redevelopment"

"There is no desire to narrow the scope of redevelopment. The staff report makes a special point of this: 'One of the principal advantages of the redevelopment program is its capacity for flexibility and diversity, allowing its use to serve local needs and objectives.'

"What the guidelines do is to establish what now are the local needs and spell out the unique role redevelopment can play in carrying out the critical policy for more low- and moderate-income family housing in San Francisco."

The Director remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning had never said that the sole purpose of redevelopment should be provision of low- and moderate-income housing; otherwise, the proposed guidelines might have been included in the Improvement Plan for Residence. Rather, the Department of City Planning had proposed that guidelines should be adopted to establish a priority for provision of low- and moderate-housing at the present time. While Mr. Evans felt that no special priority should be established and that the Redevelopment process should continue to be used in the attainment of all of the City's goals, the Director pointed out that it is impossible to aim at all goals with limited funds. In conclusion, he stated that the changes which had been proposed in the guidelines by the Redevelopment Agency would make the guidelines fundamentally different in nature; and, if such changes of wording were to be made, he felt that there would be no purpose in adopting the guidelines.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he agreed completely with the Director, given the nature of the developments which had already been undertaken by the Redevelopment Agency, he felt that the time had come for the City Planning Commission to exercise some control over the type of projects which will be undertaken in the future. He felt that the Yerba Buena Center will be a monstrosity which the City will regret for many years. Prime land within the Golden Gateway project area which is valued at \$100 a square foot is still under option by potential developers at \$35 a square foot; and he felt that private enterprise would have done a better rehabilitation job in that area than the Redevelopment Agency. The Japanese Cultural Center has little authentic Japanese flavor; and even industries which are already located in the India Basin Industrial Park do not know what will happen to them. Under the circumstances, he felt that the guidelines which had been recommended by the Director of Planning should be adopted.



September 16, 1971

Commissioner Porter stated that all of the past redevelopment projects, including the Yerba Buena Center, had been reviewed and approved by the City Planning Commission; and she noted that not all individuals have the same taste in architecture.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he was amazed at the comments which had been made by Commissioner Ritchie, particularly since he felt that the great achievements had been made through the redevelopment process. He then asked Mr. Evans to explain how credits from the Yerba Buena Center could be used to support projects in Hunters Point and in Western Addition area A-2. Mr. Evans stated that the cost of redevelopment projects are shared by the City and the Federal Government with the City paying 1/3 of the cost and the Federal Government paying the remainder. The City's share may be made in cash or in kind. The Yerba Buena Center will contain public improvements which will exceed by \$29,000,000 the City's share of the cost for that project; and, as a result, the surplus credits could be used to cover the City's share of the cost for the Hunters Point and India Basin Redevelopment Projects. Without the surplus credits from the Yerba Buena Center, those projects could not have been undertaken.

Commissioner Rueda stated that it did not seem to him that adoption of the guidelines which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would prohibit commercial or industrial redevelopment projects; rather, the guidelines would merely establish a priority for projects which would provide low- and moderate-income housing.

Commissioner Ritchie emphasized that the guidelines would affect only future projects; and he pointed out that the Redevelopment Agency is already involved in a number of projects which place emphasis on commercial and industrial developments.

Commissioner Mellon suggested that the Commission consider adopting the guidelines only through December 31, 1972, with further review of the guidelines to be conducted by the Commission on or before that date.

Mr. Evans stated that such a compromise would be acceptable to the Redevelopment Agency.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution, with a modification specifying that the guidelines will be reviewed by the Commission on or before December 31, 1972, be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6754.

At 3:45 p.m. President Newman announced a 5-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 3:50 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.



Discretionary Review of Building Application No. 398352 for Holiday Inn Hotel, Northeast Corner of Van Ness Avenue and Pine Street.

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"This Building Application has been scheduled for consideration by the City Planning Commission under its power of discretionary review on September 16, 1971. This review was scheduled after preliminary consideration of the project by the Plan Implementation Committee of the Planning Commission on July 22, 1971.

"The application was filed on June 21, 1971, well before the effective date of the interim height and bulk controls instituted under the Planning Commission's resolution of August 26, 1971. However, the building would have such an impact upon the city, and would exceed the height and bulk guidelines of the Urban Design Plan to such a degree, that review by the Commission has been deemed to be necessary. This review is according to the Commission's normal discretionary review power, since the application in question is not directly subject to the interim controls put into effect in August.

"The Proposal"

"The site has frontages of 203 feet along Van Ness Avenue and 200.5 feet along Pine Street, and an area of 37,082.6 square feet. It is located in the topographic saddle between Nob Hill and Pacific Heights, near the bottom of this depression. At this point Van Ness Avenue has a slight upward slope to the north, just prior to its levelling off for its descent to the Bay.

"A Holiday Inn Hotel is proposed by San Francisco Chatmar Associates as developer. Chatmar is an interior furnishings firm in its origin, but it now owns five Holiday Inns in northern California: at San Rafael, Concord, Monterey, Carmel and Santa Cruz. The project architect is Edward H. Duerr.

"The hotel in its present form would contain 504 rooms. Its tower would rise 25 stories to a height of 241 feet above Van Ness Avenue. If the building were in a zoning height limit area, nine feet of the 25-foot high penthouse would also have to be counted as building height, making the total height 250 feet.

"The tower is 178 feet in length and 60 feet in width, forming a north-south slab that is set back 40 feet from Van Ness Avenue. The tower rests on a base element 52 feet in height.



September 16, 1971

"In the tower, 494 rooms are arranged in 19 floors, with 26 rooms per floor. Ten additional rooms are next to the pool behind the tower. In the base element, there is one level below grade with meeting rooms and service facilities, then a ground level with lobby and commercial space, followed by four levels of parking. Two banquet halls are adjacent to the east along Pine Street. In all, the floor area is 358,556 square feet, for a floor area ratio of 9.7 to 1 for the entire building.

"Parking for 300 cars is provided, all above the ground level, with access from Van Ness Avenue. There is an entrance drive inside the property line, parallel to Van Ness Avenue. The garage levels are open on the east wall, and enclosed by anodized aluminum screens along the two streets.

"In the remainder of the building, the exterior material is predominantly cement plaster of a light color, with bronze-toned aluminum window frames and occasional aggregate panels. At ground level, the walls are of concrete block.

#### "History of the Project"

"According to the developers, consideration of this project began toward the middle of 1969. There was contact with the Department of City Planning staff at that time, on a very general basis. The lots making up the site were purchased by the developer in November 1969 and May 1970.

"Department review of preliminary plans began early in 1970 and continued to July of that year. A staff analysis of urban design considerations and problems was prepared in February 1970, and the findings were explained to the developers' architect.

"It appears that there was no further contact between the developers and the Department from July 1970 until the site permit application was filed in June 1971. It was the Department's impression that the project was either dormant or abandoned. During this time, the Department's Urban Design Study moved to completion with the publication of height and bulk guidelines in the fall of 1970 and publication of the Urban Design Plan in May 1971.

"The developers have stated that they were engaged in obtaining financing in the last half of 1970, and that further agreements were being entered into up to the filing of the site permit application. During July and August of 1971, there were a number of meetings of the Department and the developers to determine whether modifications in the plans would be feasible.



"Urban Design Guidelines

"The staff analysis prepared in February 1970 has proved to be consistent with the preliminary and final guidelines of the Urban Design Plan. It was indicated that both height and bulk were important factors, and that the project as it was developing would greatly exceed the guidelines. Other early comments were made concerning the need for an exterior treatment that would complement the San Francisco skyline.

"The Urban Design Plan provides for a maximum height along Van Ness Avenue in the range of 89 to 160 feet. As proposed, the building would exceed the upper end of this range by 81 feet. The bulk guidelines, above a height of 80 feet, call for a maximum of 110 feet in the plan dimension and 125 feet in the diagonal plan dimension, as compared with dimensions of 178 feet and 189 feet proposed in this project.

"Both height and bulk are very significant to topographic form and citywide building patterns at this location, due to its prominence and its position between two hills. Along Van Ness Avenue from City Hall to the Fontana Apartments, the highest structure is the office portion of the Jack Tar, with a height of 140 feet. A number of other buildings range from 75 to 110 feet in height.

"Changes from the 1970 Plans

"Between the time of the first Department review in early 1970 and the filing of the Building Application, the scale of this project was reduced somewhat, although not necessarily in response to the urban design concerns expressed by the Department. The number of rooms was originally 608, and this number remained the same, but the rooms were made smaller and some of the parking and convention facilities were removed. The stories were reduced from 31 to 26, and the height from 322 feet to 251 feet. A revolving rooftop restaurant was also removed. These changes made it possible for the building to come within the allowable floor area ratio.

"In addition, signs at the top of the building were brought down to within 60 feet of street level, which is now the maximum height permitted, and the tower has been set back from Van Ness Avenue.

"Though fairly significant in their aggregate, these changes did not substantially reduce the discrepancies between the proposed building and the guidelines of the Urban Design Plan.



September 16, 1971

"The Developers' Constraints

"Since the filing of the application for a 608-room hotel, the Department staff has investigated with the developers, their project architect, and the coordinating architects for Holiday Inns in Memphis, what appear to be all the desirable means for modifying this project to bring it within the urban design guidelines. Unfortunately, there are a great many constraints which have led the developers and the architects to conclude that major redesign is infeasible.

"Many of the constraints are established by standardized arrangements and building economics determined by the Memphis office. These constraints pertain to such things as building length and width, number of rooms per floor, distance to stairways, column placement, the requirement that there be only one building tower, inability to vary wall planes to reduce the appearance of bulk, fixed room rent levels, the need for free parking for guests, and the nature of exterior materials.

"In addition, the developers' position and the character of the site establish other constraints. The investment in land and other commitments to this point is reported to be about 1.6 million dollars. Commitments and rising costs are said to require that the project move ahead quickly, precluding extensive redesign. A minimum number of rooms has been established, and it is required that the rooms afford excellent views for their occupants. It has been determined that no more than one underground level is feasible, both on the basis of higher construction costs due to ground water problems and because of the functional difficulty of placing part of the parking beneath the ground story.

"Finally, it is considered vital by the developers that convention facilities for up to 2500 persons be provided. This is a large number, when compared with the Jack Tar Hotel (1000 persons) and the other three Holiday Inns in San Francisco: at Fisherman's Wharf (350 persons), Eighth Street (140 persons) and Kearny Street (100 persons). The program, however, calls for this to be a major convention hotel.

"Changes in the Plans Being Offered by the Developers

"As a result of the recent meetings with the Department, the developers have made some accommodation to the urban design guidelines. They have obtained agreements from Holiday Inns and their financing institution for a reduction in the number of rooms, leaving a total of 504 rooms in a building of reduced size.



"This reduction in rooms has made possible a lessening in some degree of both the height and length of the building. The rooms per floor have been reduced from 30 to 26, reducing the length of the building from 203 to 178 feet. In addition, the height has been reduced from 251 to 241 feet by removing one story, leaving a total of 25 stories. Two rooms have been relocated from the tower to the pool area on the lower platform. Relocation of more rooms to that area could have reduced the tower height further, but apparently such relocation is not deemed feasible.

"These modifications are the developers' preferred method of distributing the number of rooms they are now proposing. Two other methods that might be possible are considered less desirable by the developers. One would be to maintain the building length at 203 feet but remove two or three additional stories. The other method, which is not considered efficient, would be to maintain the height at 26 stories but reduce the building length even further.

"While these various methods of modifying the building show a genuine interest on the part of the developers in bringing the project somewhat closer to the urban design guidelines, the discrepancies would still be very great. Among the three methods, the one formally proposed by the developers (that is, a limited reduction of both height and length) would appear to accomplish the most in terms of scaling down the total tower design in some degree while avoiding even more awkward proportions.

"Some discussion has been given to the question of a possible change in the orientation of the tower slab from a north-south direction to an east-west direction along Pine Street. However, such a change would entail a complete redesign for the developers without any advantages from an urban design standpoint; in fact, an east-west orientation would have a more adverse effect upon the form of the city."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, read the following statement:

"This proposed hotel building presents an extremely difficult case for the Staff and for the City Planning Commission.

"On the one hand, the developers have proceeded with the project for a period of approximately two years, and have made commitments toward development including purchase of the land. They have stated that their actions have been in good faith, and we have no reason to doubt the basic sincerity of this statement.



September 16, 1971

"On the other hand, there is no denying the extreme differences between the plans proposed, especially in the height and bulk of the building, and the guidelines and objectives of the Urban Design Plan.

"This project does not come directly under the interim controls for height and bulk put into effect by the Commission on August 26. If it did come under those controls, it could not even be considered. The building application was filed in June, and Commission review was scheduled for today after preliminary consideration by a committee of the Commission in July. Today's review would have been carried out whether or not the Urban Design Plan had been adopted by the Commission, and whether or not the interim controls had been put into effect.

"In a review of this building under the Commission's normal discretionary power, it is the Staff's view that the building would nonetheless have extremely unfortunate effects upon the City. It would present a bulky, slab-like structure of considerable height in an area of the City traditionally kept free of tall buildings, with the result that the valley between two hills would disappear from the San Francisco skyline. With the pattern thus broken, other tall buildings would be likely to follow, and the height limits proposed for this whole part of the City could become meaningless. It is precisely this type of building that the Urban Design Plan guidelines were drawn up to prevent.

"This is an unfortunate case in which most of the decisions in designing of the building have become foregone conclusions because of standardized arrangements and building economics dictated by a National Central Office, without taking account of the individual City for which the building is intended. The developers have tried, within their many constraints, to moderate the design, but without significant success. They have not been able to alter the height and bulk in a major way, and even the exterior materials and finishes come from a national mold based on economic considerations.

"The Department's concerns were expressed to the developers' architect in the contacts during the first half of 1970. If there had been further contacts later in 1970 or early in 1971, these concerns would have been re-expressed and further emphasized. The building application was filed a month later the publication of the finished Urban Design Plan, and its contradiction of the plan is very apparent. Under these circumstances, I can see no alternative to a recommendation of disapproval of this application."

President Newman advised individuals who were present in the audience that a discretionary review of the subject building permit application had been recommended by a three member committee of the Commission.



Jackson C. Stromberg, attorney for San Francisco Chatmar Associates, advised the Commission that the proposed project had a long history behind it; and he assured the Commission that the building had not been conceived in a hurried effort to have a building permit application approved before enactment of the legislation proposed in the Urban Design Plan. Since some of the individuals who were present to speak in behalf of the subject application would have to leave the meeting early, Mr. Stromberg indicated that he preferred to call on them before proceeding with his presentation.

Joseph Bilardi, member of the San Francisco Labor Council and President of the Culinary Workers, remarked that he represented 25,000 people who would benefit from construction of the proposed hotel. When work does not expand for culinary workers, the industry actually moves backward. Furthermore, he felt that there is a need for additional hotel facilities in San Francisco to support the city's third largest industry which is tourism; and he remarked that several large conventions have already been turned away because adequate facilities were not available. While the proposed building might block views, he pointed out that views are often blocked for the working man; however, the most important thing for the working man is that his job not be lost. He hoped that the Commission would see fit to approve the building permit application.

Irving K. Baldwin, Executive Director of the Hotel Employers Association of San Francisco, stated that he represented almost all of the convention hotels in San Francisco; he informed the Commission that those hotels were not opposed to the proposed project and that they would, in fact, welcome the competition which the new hotel would bring. He believed that the Yerba Buena Center complex, when completed, will generate a demand for more hotel rooms than are presently available in the city. Furthermore, he noted that hotels are clustered in certain areas of the City; and he felt that the proposed hotel would not be inappropriate on Van Ness Avenue since so few hotel rooms now exist in that area.

Mr. Stromberg reviewed the consultations which had been held with the staff of the Department of City Planning regarding the proposed building since 1969. He stated that height and bulk restrictions had never been mentioned by the staff of the Department of City Planning except on July 2, 1970, when an indication was given that height and bulk limits would be established as conditions if the applicant should file a request for a variance. Since a decision was made not to file for a variance, it was assumed that no special height or bulk control would apply. The property was purchased in 1970; and a firm construction contract was entered into. More recently, after the City Planning Commission had decided to conduct a discretionary review of the building permit application, the applicant had attempted to reduce the proposed building to the minimum possible size by eliminating one hundred rooms from the plans; and it was felt that the reduction represented a very substantial compromise.



September 16, 1971

Mr. Stromberg felt that section 302 (e) of the City Planning Code established a clear cut-off point for zoning standards which may be enacted into law; and he believed that the discretionary review which was presently being conducted by the Commission, in which standards which have not as yet been enacted into law would be applied, would constitute a subversion of the intent of section 302 (e) of the City Planning Code. Therefore, he asked the Commission to look at the matter independently and objectively without reference to the Urban Design guidelines which had not yet been enacted into law.

Mr. Stromberg assured the Commission that the proposed project was based on a sound economic foundation. He stated that there is a substantial need for moderately priced rooms in convention hotels in San Francisco; and he remarked that that need would be fulfilled by the proposed hotel. The proposed hotel would have significantly more convention facilities other than Holiday Inns in San Francisco; and, since the subject property is located on a major thoroughfare and out of the area of major downtown traffic congestion, he felt that it would be an appropriate location for the proposed facility. Furthermore, if the hotel were to be constructed, San Francisco's tourist industry would benefit from the efforts of the sales staff of the world's largest hotel chain whose efforts would be geared to bringing conventions to the proposed hotel. Mr. Stromberg stated that the applicant had already spent more than \$1,600,000 on the project; and, in addition, he had made every effort to conform to the standards which had been set by the staff of the Department of City Planning. The building permit application had been filed before the Commission had expressed its intention to consider specific legislation to effectuate the height and bulk guidelines of the Urban Design Plan; and, as a result, he felt that section 302 (e) of the City Planning Code would exempt the subject application from those standards. He displayed a rendering which had been prepared of the proposed building; and he remarked that the actual height of the 25-story building would be comparable to the height of a 20-story office building since the ceilings in the hotel would have a height of only 9½ feet.

Stephen F. Snow, Executive Vice-President of the Motor Car Dealers Association of San Francisco, remarked that Van Ness Avenue had been known as "Automobile Row" for many years; however, during the past five years, the number of automobile dealers on the street had been reduced from 45 to 29. Because of high land, building and labor costs in San Francisco, dealers on Van Ness Avenue cannot compete with dealers located in peripheral areas; and, as a result, the economic situation on Van Ness Avenue has become increasingly critical. Furthermore, the recent General Motors and Longshoremen's strikes had been extremely damaging to the automobile dealers. Reading from a letter which he had previously addressed to President Newman, he advised the Commission that the members of the Motor Car Dealers Association of San Francisco were in support of the subject application for the following reasons:

- "1. Both the employees and guests of such a facility would mean increased sales in our dealerships on Van Ness Auto Row.



September 16, 1971

- "2. The service business of our dealers would be enhanced by the presence of vehicles of both employees and guests.
- "3. Facilities for meetings and accommodations for factory personnel would be an additional convenience.
- "4. Finally, given the well-established quality of Chatmar Holiday Inn facilities and business practices, we firmly believe this construction would be an asset to the entire avenue and surrounding business community as well as to the City of San Francisco."

President Newman read a letter which he had received from William E. Dauer, Executive Vice-President of the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, as follows:

"This letter is in reference to our conversation regarding the site permit application for the Holiday Inn at Van Ness Avenue and Pine Street. We believe this application raises a question of fairness that should be given due consideration.

"When the Planning Commission adopted the resolution on August 26 it had the effect under the City Planning Code of applying certain standards of the Urban Design Plan to all applications filed subsequent to such date, even though such standards are not now, and may not become the law. We are advised that the Planning Department staff seeks to apply such standards to the Holiday Inn application even though it was filed well before August 26 and therefore not within the applicable section of the City Planning Code.

"If this were a project that were hurriedly put together in an effort to beat the new standards, it would not be a matter of concern. Instead, the project has a long history of substantial sums already having been expended during the time the developer consulted with the Planning Department staff and making substantial compromises even though not required by existing law or the August 26 resolution.

"We feel that it is not in the best interests of the city to develop a reputation that it deals unfairly and arbitrarily with the developers. The factor of a reputation of fairness is also of considerable significance in generating support for the passage of portions of the Urban Design Plan into law since, as we understand it, the effect of its adoption would be to vest in the staff of the Planning Department substantially more control over development in San Francisco than has heretofore existed.



September 16, 1971

"In considering this application we urge that you apply the general standards of discretionary review and not the guidelines of the Urban Design Plan. We feel on the basis of general standards this project should be approved and will serve a true contribution for housing convention delegates and visitors in a Class A facility at a \$21.00-\$25.00 figure that many people can afford.

"At your request I would be happy to meet with members of the City Planning Commission or the City Planning staff and try to work out any detail that would allow this facility to proceed.

"When we visited with you and Alan Jacobs recently the Chamber stated that they would agree to the Urban Design Plan and not oppose the August 26 resolution hoping that we could all work together for projects that will be helpful to San Francisco and at the same time improve the business climate."

Agnes Barnhill, representing the Cooks Union, stated that the members of her union would profit from construction of the proposed hotel. She stated that cooks live where they work; and, if jobs are not available in San Francisco, they would be forced to leave the City. She stated that cooks are moderate income family people; and, since the City has repeatedly expressed concern about retaining middle income families with children, she felt that they should not take an action which would deprive such people of jobs in the City. She stated that the Cooks Union is representative of an integrated industry; and she felt that the subject application should be approved so that jobs for cooks would continue to be available in the city.

Al Reen, representing the Hotel, Motel, & Club Service Workers Union, stated that the members of his union are primarily minority people; and he believed that the proposed hotel would provide between 125 and 150 jobs for older minority people. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the application would be approved.

Mel Dagovitz, representing the Polk Street Merchants Association, stated that the members of his organization had voted unanimously to endorse the proposed project. That decision had been based on a number of reasons; however, he felt that the most compelling factor was that the members of the organization believed that it would be inequitable to apply zoning laws retroactively.

Robert J. Sullivan, General Manager of the Convention and Visitors Bureau, indicated his support of the applicant's proposal.

Werner Jasper, representing the Jasper Construction Company, stated that he had served as contractor for San Francisco Chatmar Associates on other projects which had been undertaken by that firm; and, contrary to the statements which had been made by the Director of Planning, he assured the Commission that the proposed building would be of the finest possible construction and design.



September 16, 1971

Mr. Fleishhacker asked about the approximate cost of the proposed building. Mr. Jasper estimated that the building would cost approximately three times as much a square foot as the last Holiday Hotel which was constructed in San Francisco 1½ years ago.

William H. Gilmartin, 2224 Clay Street, remarked that he owns stock in the Holiday Inn Corporation. Nevertheless, while he considered the firm to be an efficient business organization, he regarded the firm as being completely lacking in vision with regard to architecture and other amenities of life. The bridge which was constructed across Kearny Street by the Holiday Inn, Corp. was, in his opinion, a typical example of the firm's failure to respect local standards. He felt that the building presently being proposed would be completely out of scale with the neighborhood in which it would be located, especially since it would have a height approximately 100 feet greater than that of the Jack Tar Hotel. In fact, the proposed building would rise higher than Lafayette Square. While some people might have been caught unaware by the Urban Design Plan, he felt that the plan itself and the public reaction to it had been no secret. He appreciated the need for jobs in San Francisco; and he felt that hotel use of the subject site would be appropriate. However, because of the size of the structure being proposed by the applicant, and because the building would be totally lacking in any architecture significance, he felt that the application should be disapproved unless the height of the building were to be reduced.

Emma Alice Suojanen, a resident of "Polk Gulch", felt that action on the subject application should be deferred until the electorate has had an opportunity to vote on the Duskin Amendment which will appear on the November ballot. She remarked that the Urban Design Plan contained guidelines which suggested that the height of buildings along Van Ness Avenue should be within the range of 88 feet to 160 feet; and, if the present applicants were allowed to exceed those standards, the building would inevitably become the first of many such buildings on the street. Miss Suojanen believed that the tax revenue which is derived from high-rise buildings does not meet the cost of the services which the City must provide for such buildings. She also felt that the proposed building would have an undesirable effect on the quality of life in "Polk Gulch" because it would bring more traffic, more people, more noise, and more litter to the area. While the businessmen in the area had taken the position that the proposed project would be of economic benefit to the area, she felt that more development of the same type along Van Ness Avenue would ultimately raise rents in the neighborhood to a level which merchants now doing business in the area could not afford. She stated that she was opposed to the construction of any tall buildings in the subject neighborhood because they would cut out sunlight, create shadows, and change everything in the area. She felt the high-rise buildings are symbols of economic exploitation; and she remarked that most of the tall buildings in San Francisco have been constructed during the last five or six years by people who have profited from the war in Southeast Asia. Like the pyramids and medieval castles, she regarded high-rise buildings as being symbols of the exploitation of one group of people by another.



September 16, 1971

Edward Bielski, representing the Committee for a Vote on High-Rise, stated that he was convinced that San Francisco Chatmar Associates were aware of the Urban Design Plan but they had not acted in good faith. Furthermore, since the various employees unions and the Convention and Visitors Bureau had not been represented when the Pierre Hotel was under consideration by the Commission, he assumed that someone had encouraged them to appear to speak in favor of the subject application. The spokesman for the applicant had stated that there will be a need for additional convention hotels in the City when Yerba Buena Center is completed; but he did not believe that the Center would ever be built. He asked whether San Francisco is to be a tourist City or a City in which people live and work; and he indicated that he felt that the latter role would be more appropriate. Yet, even though he is a union member, he did not feel that it would be proper for him to argue that more and more Safeway and Mayfair Supermarkets should be constructed along Van Ness Avenue so that the members of his union would be assured of more jobs. While the applicant had claimed that the economics of the proposed project were sound, Mr. Bielski doubted that loans could be obtained for any project of such magnitude until the Duskin Initiative is acted upon by the voters in November. In any case, regardless of the opinions of those who have spoken in favor of the application, he pointed out that it is the responsibility of the City Planning Commission to represent all of the citizens of San Francisco when planning decisions are to be made.

Norman Rolfe, representing San Francisco Tomorrow, stated that it was apparent that the applicants had failed to realize that San Francisco is a highly individualist city and not at all like the average American community; and that actions like this by hotel chains could easily "Kill the goose that lays the golden eggs" in San Francisco. He felt that the proposed building would ruin the desirability of the subject neighborhood as a residential area; and he remarked that businesses along Polk Street would inevitably be "wiped out" if the middle income people who presently reside in the area should be forced to move to other areas of the City because of the rise in rental costs which would accompany development of the area with high-rise buildings. He urged that the subject permit application be disapproved.

Lewis Lindsay regarded the proposed project as just another money-making venture which would result in a building which would be aesthetically destructive and hideous and ecologically out of balance. No land seems to be available for low cost homes which are seriously needed in the City; yet, ample space seems to be available for higher cost residential buildings and hotels. He did not believe that construction of the proposed building would result in the creation of more jobs; the hotel would only absorb workers who might otherwise find employment elsewhere. High-rise buildings disturb the character of existing neighborhoods and create greater traffic congestion; and, as a result, people are forced to move to find more appealing residential neighborhoods.



John Jacobs, Executive Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that his organization had supported adoption of the Urban Design Plan by the City Planning Commission; and, at the same time, it had opposed the Duskin Initiative. The Chamber of Commerce, also, had taken a position in opposition to the Duskin Initiative; however, since the Chamber had endorsed the present application, it was obvious that the Chamber did not realize that approval of the proposed building would probably lead to approval of the Duskin Initiative by the electorate in November. Furthermore, he felt that the labor union representatives who had spoken in favor of the subject application should recognize that approval of the Duskin Initiative would reduce the number of jobs available in San Francisco. While the applicant's contractor had described the proposed building as a costly structure, Mr. Jacobs observed that it would still be a cheap building by San Francisco standards; and, in any case, the building would be too large and would be located in the wrong place. Under the circumstances, he felt that the application should be disapproved by the Commission. Furthermore, if the Commission were to approve the application, it seemed to him that since the general public does not understand "grandfather clauses" it could not be expected to understand the Commission's motives, particularly in view of the fact that the Urban Design Plan had been adopted only three weeks ago.

Sherwood Stockwell stated that he had been asked by John Woodridge, a San Francisco Architect, to read a statement which he had written out before he had been forced to leave the meeting room to keep another appointment; however, since most of the points raised in the letter had already been covered by previous speakers, Mr. Stockwell submitted the statement for the files instead of reading it. The statement urged that the subject building permit application be disapproved because it would result in construction of a building which would conflict with the principles of the Urban Design Plan, thus providing more ammunition for individuals who desire to prevent construction of all high buildings in San Francisco.

Mr. Stockwell then summarized and submitted a letter which had been signed by himself, by Henrik Bull, by John Lewis Field, and by Daniel G. Volkmann, all members of the Architectural firm of Bull, Field, Volkmann and Stockwell. The letter called for disapproval of the subject building permit application because it would not in any way be in conformance with the spirit or standards of the Urban Design Plan as indicated by the following points:

- "a. Its height and bulk are too great for the surrounding neighborhoods.
- "b. Its location in the valley between Lafayette Park Hill and Nob Hill will cut off the sense of the hills of the city.
- "c. The great width of Van Ness Avenue makes the material and design of buildings particularly important and neither the street level view or the skyline would be enhanced by the project. The choice of materials is unusually impermanent for a high-rise, long life structure, and the 60-foot high aluminum grille will be deadening for the street."



In conclusion, Mr. Stockwell pointed out that the proposed building, as depicted in the rendering which had been submitted by the applicants, appeared to be identical in height to the adjacent Crocker-Citizens Bank; yet, the base of the proposed building would actually have a height of 6 stories. The rendering was therefore inaccurate.

Marion Hinman, 1000 Francisco Street, urged that the building permit application be denied.

Leigh Bergh felt that another high-rise hotel is not needed in San Francisco; and she felt that the Holiday Inn Corporation already has done enough damage in San Francisco by constructing three hotels too many thus far. In her opinion, the quality of life in San Francisco is more important than trying to look like other American cities.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that Mr. Svirsky had stated during his report that the staff of analysis of urban design considerations and problems relating to the proposed building was prepared in February 1970, and that the findings were explained to the developer's architect. Yet, Mr. Stromberg had stated that urban design considerations had never been mentioned except on July 2, 1970. Because of the apparent disagreement regarding the date of discussion, he asked if the architect for the applicant was present in the audience.

Mr. Edward H. Duerr, architect for the applicant, recalled that plans for the project had been submitted to the Department for review in January, 1970; however, no response had been received until May, 1970, partially because the applicant was having problems financing the project at that time and had not pushed for approval of the plans by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the staff of the Department of City Planning in July, 1970; and, to the best of his knowledge, that was the first occasion which Urban Design terms of reference had been mentioned.

Mr. Svirsky stated that the Urban Design terms of reference had been prepared in February, 1970; however, if the staff had had no further contact with the applicant between January, 1970 and May, 1970, it was probably that the applicant had not been made aware of the urban design terms of reference in February 1970.

Mr. Stromberg stated that the applicant's architect had given him a detailed list of all of the meetings which had been attended by him with the staff of the Department of City Planning; and that list indicated that a meeting had been held on July 2, 1970, with Mr. Hedman and that urban design factors were discussed at that time. However, Mr. Hedman had stated that no conditions would be established regarding the urban design standards unless a variance were to be required for the proposed building. If the building conformed to the standards of the City Planning Code, the applicant would not have to anticipate any additional problems.



September 16, 1971

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Urban Design Plan may have been in a formulative state during the early part of 1970; however, since she had no knowledge of the new height and bulk standards being proposed at that time, she did not understand how private developers might have been expected to be aware of the standards. The Director replied that the staff of the Department of City Planning had always prepared urban design guidelines for major buildings even before the Urban Design Study was initiated; and he indicated that the urban design guidelines to which Mr. Svirsky had referred had been prepared specifically for the subject site.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the applicant had exercised his option to purchase the subject property only after being advised that no problems would develop regarding approval of the building permit application if the building being proposed would conform to the standards of the City Planning Code without requiring variances. Mr. Stromberg replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the applicant had prepared plans for a very complicated project before the Commission had expressed its intention to consider specific legislation to implement the height and bulk guidelines contained in the Urban Design Plan; and he felt that it was unfortunate that the building had now been brought before the Commission for review. He noted that none of the previous speakers had commented on the character of Van Ness Avenue which was, for the most part, hastily built after the earthquake and fire. In his opinion, the street is very drab; and he indicated that it reminds him of a typical street in a mid-western city. Only a few public landmarks such as the Civic Center, various churches and a private club exist along the street; and the landscaping which has been installed in the median strip is meager and only average in appearance. Yet, if new development could be encouraged on Van Ness Avenue, the street could become a great thoroughfare in the future. He felt that the subject property lies in a neighborhood which is greatly in need of the new development; and, since the site is located in a flat area, construction of the building being proposed would not block any views. He felt that the building would be appropriate for the site; and, even though the building would exceed the height recommended in the Urban Design Guidelines by 81 feet, he did not feel that that would be such a bad thing. He noted that the building would be placed on the site in such a way that it would cause the least possible damage. He also emphasized that the applicant had worked on plans for the project for a long period of time and that he had already spent almost two million dollars on the project; and, in that regard, the matter presently under consideration was considerably different from the case in which the Commission had disapproved a building permit application for an apartment building on Russian Hill where the applicant's only financial involvement was a \$165,000 deposit which he had made to obtain control of the property. While he acknowledged that the design of the proposed building could be improved, he felt that the most important factors were that the building should be light in color and that ample trees should be planted at street level. In fact, he personally felt that it would be desi-



rable if the building could be set back 10 or 15 feet from the property line along Van Ness Avenue so that additional planting could be installed. He believed that the proposed building would bring new vitality to Van Ness Avenue; and he felt that the permit application should be approved.

Commissioner Finn remarked that there seemed to be some confusion not only among the general public present in the audience but also among the professionals regarding the legal authority under which the Commission could act on the subject application. He noted that the Director had emphasized that the Commission was not considering the application in the light of the interim urban design controls which were recently put into effect by the Commission; rather, the application was being considered by the Commission under its ordinary discretionary review authority. Commissioner Finn felt that it was important to point out to everyone present that review of the application's conformance to the interim urban design controls not only would be unfair but would probably be illegal, also. He stated that there is ample precedent to establish the fact that no administrative or legislative body may take action adopting and applying new legislation to a matter currently pending before it. In conclusion, he emphasized that any action which might be taken by the Commission would be taken under the Commission's discretionary review authority.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted and that the subject permit application be disapproved. He stated that he was grateful that the City Planning Commission has discretionary review authority to prevent potential disasters; and he regretted only that the Commission had not been more willing to exercise those powers in the past to prevent the construction of buildings such as the Fontana Apartments. He stated that the authority should be exercised sparingly and only when matters of great importance are at stake; and he felt that the matter presently under consideration was of great importance. In his opinion, all of the arguments which had been offered by Commissioner Ritchie in support of the application could be turned around 180 degrees and then used to argue for disapproval of the application. The subject site is located in a saddle and not on flat land, and the building proposed by the applicant would be unattractive. He felt that the building would be a major disaster; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it was extremely important that the Commission should disapprove the application. While he did not question the honor and integrity of the applicant, he felt that the applicant had been negligent in feeling the public pulse; and it seemed extremely odd to him that anyone who would spend so much money on property and good attorneys would fail to have become aware of the urban design standards which were under consideration by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He remarked that the real estate business has many hazards, one of which is the possibility of running into conflict with the City Planning Commission; and he indicated that such circumstances occur quite often. He felt that the subject application should be disapproved.



September 16, 1971

When it was apparent that no second to Mr. Fleishhacker's motion was forthcoming from other members of the Commission, President Newman relinquished the Chair to Commissioner Porter and seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he disagreed completely with the comments which had been made by Commissioner Fleishhacker. He did not feel that the building would be a disaster or that it would destroy the environment of the subject neighborhood; in fact, the building would replace a very poor installation which occupies the site at the present time. He felt that the proposed building would enhance the neighborhood; and, as a result, the City as a whole. Furthermore, he could not agree that the subject property is located in a valley. While Polk Street may lie in a valley, Van Ness Avenue, at the intersection of Pine Street, is on a hillside.

Commissioner Mellon also remarked that the height guidelines which were contained in the Urban Design Plan would allow construction of buildings with heights up to 240 feet within one-half block of the subject site. While he was enthusiastic about the Urban Design Plan, he did not feel that the guidelines which it contains should be so rigidly applied that they result in situations in which a building could not be constructed on a particular piece of property while an identical building could be constructed on property located on a distance of only one-half block away. While some people might regard the jobs which would be provided by the hotel as unimportant, his participation in the work of the Manpower Commission of the EOC had made it clear that such jobs would be extremely important for the City, particularly since most of the jobs would be of a type which could be filled by people without a great deal of training. The construction jobs which would be provided by the project initially would only be temporary in nature; however, the jobs which would be available in the facility when it is completed would be permanent. He asked the applicant's representative approximately how many permanent jobs would be made available by the proposed project. Mr. Stromberg estimated that the project would provide an excess of 500 jobs.

Commissioner Mellon felt that the importance of those permanent jobs could not be understated. Furthermore, he disagreed with individuals who would say that the jobs would become available elsewhere if the application were to be disapproved. He stated that jobs must be created, especially for minority people. He did not feel that the proposed building would destroy the environment of the neighborhood; and, since business people from the area who would be most affected by the proposed development had endorsed it, he felt that the application should be approved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not object to construction of a hotel on the subject site which would meet the city's need for additional convention facilities and for additional jobs. However, because of the height and bulk of the proposed building, and because it had not been properly designed, he did not feel that the Commission should act to approve the subject building permit application.



September 16, 1971

Commissioner Mellon remarked that the applicant could not afford to construct the building unless it were large enough to be economically sound.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the building could be reduced inside and still be economically viable even though it might not bring quite as much profit to the owners.

Commissioner Mellon did not disagree; however, he felt that the applicant's unfortunate experiences with the Department of City Planning should be taken into account, also.

President Newman agreed with Commissioner Mellon that jobs are most important to the City; however, in the present instance, he did not feel that the need for new jobs should be used to justify approval of a bad building. Because of the height, size and location of the subject property, the proposed building would represent an extremely undesirable addition to the City's building stock; and it would destroy the beauty of Van Ness Avenue and Polk Gulch. The proposed building would have a height 50% greater than the limits established by the Urban Design Plan, and a width 78% greater than specified in the Plan, and a diagonal dimension which would be 80% greater than specified by the Plan. While the discretionary review was not being conducted in terms of those specific standards, he did feel that the proposed building, which had been described to him by Mr. Chatham as the largest Holiday Inn in the United States, would be too large for the subject site; and, for that reason, it would be detrimental to San Francisco. He felt that the size of the building should be reduced.

Hugh Chatham of San Francisco Chatmar Associates stated that with the reduced number of rooms this hotel would no longer be the largest Holiday Inn in the country.

Commissioner Rueda remarked that tourism is one of the few industries in San Francisco which is actually providing work for local people; and he felt that tourism would eventually decline if San Francisco does not provide a sufficient number of first class hotels to meet increasing demands. He regarded larger facilities as being more appropriate for the City than smaller operations such as those located along Lombard Street; and, particularly since the proposed hotel would provide first class facilities at reasonable prices, he felt that the building permit application should be approved.

Commissioner Porter stated that she would reluctantly vote with Commissioners Fleishhacker and Newman for disapproval of the permit application. She felt that it was extremely unfortunate that the applicant had been encouraged by the staff of the Department of City Planning to purchase the subject property with the understanding that any building conforming to the floor area ratio standards of the City Planning Code could be constructed on the site with no difficulty; however, since she had already stated that she would not vote in favor of any building which would not conform to the guidelines



September 16, 1971

specified in the Urban Design Plan, she could not vote for approval of the subject application. She stated that she had been a member of the Commission Committee which had recommended that the building permit application be made the subject of a discretionary review before the full Commission; however, considering the background of the case, she felt that the developer had received a rather shabby deal.

Commissioner Finn remarked that the urban environment of San Francisco is made up of diverse architectural styles, some in good taste and some in bad taste; however, when they are all put together, they provide the city with its originality, charm, and beauty. In his opinion, the proposed building would bring a vast improvement to Van Ness Avenue and to the subject neighborhood; and, in addition, it would create jobs which are extremely important to the City. Under the circumstances, he intended to cast his vote in favor of the building.

When the question was called, Commissioners Fleishhacker, Newman and Porter voted "Aye", Commissioners Finn, Mellon, Ritchie and Rueda, voted "No". Therefore, the motion was defeated.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried 4 - 3 that Resolution No. 6755 be adopted and that Building Application No. 398352 be approved. Commissioners Finn, Mellon, Ritchie and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioners Fleishhacker, Newman and Porter voted "No".

**Discretionary Review of Preliminary Plans for Conversion of Existing Building to Moderate Income Elderly Housing at 15th and Mission Streets (St. Vincent de Paul).**

Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning, reported on the matter as follows:

"Scheduled for Commission review today under its discretionary review powers is the proposed conversion of the present St. Vincent de Paul salvage warehouse and retail sales outlet at 1825 Mission Street to 124 dwelling units for moderate and low income elderly persons sponsored by the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

"The purpose of the discretionary review is to determine the appropriateness of the density proposed. Section 130 of the City Planning Code provides that the number of dwelling units permissible in a C district shall be the same as permitted a transitional use in the nearest R district provided that the number of units permitted in a C-1 and C-2 district shall not be less than permitted in an R-3 district, and that number of units permitted in a C-3 district shall not be less than permitted in an R-5 district. The minimum permissible number of units in a C-M district is not specifically described. The C-M district is a less restrictive district than the C-3 district, and for this reason the Zoning Administrator



September 16, 1971

has interpreted the Code to allow an R-5 density for the C-M district. However, as the C-M district, unlike the C-3 district, may be adjacent to or near low and medium density residential zoning districts. He has recommended that where proposed C-M district residential development proposal exceeds the density permitted a transitional use in the nearest R district that such development be reviewed under the discretionary powers of the City Planning Commission. In the subject case the 124 proposed dwelling units represent a density of one unit for each 183.1 square feet of the 22,800 square foot parcel of land on which the project is located. The R-5 district would allow a density of one unit for each 125 square feet of lot area, but the nearest R district is the R-3 district at 15th Street and Julian Avenue where a transitional use would be permitted a density of only one dwelling unit for each 600 square feet of lot area.

"In the C-M district a hotel unrestricted as to number of rooms would be a principal permitted use.

"The existing building contains 43,160 square feet. Most of this building area is structurally sound and would be retained in the conversion. A portion of the existing building would be razed and replaced along with the addition of floor space at the fourth floor level. A total of 132 elderly persons, mostly men, would be accommodated by the proposed 116 single rooms and 8 double rooms. Accessory rooms would include a laundry, two game rooms and a lounge and kitchenette. Area for accommodating approximately one half of the proposed residents for a central dining service is provided.

"The subject property fronts onto Mission Street and Minna Street, and rooms would face these two streets as well as a central court and a proposed 30 foot wide parking area along the south wall of the building. Off-street parking for 25 automobiles would be provided, and the proposal would require a variance from the Zoning Administrator as the Planning Code otherwise requires a minimum of 62 parking spaces for such a project. Additionally, because the existing building does not have a rear yard as required by the Code for a dwelling a variance will have to be sought for this aspect also. The face of the existing building is proposed to be remodeled to give it a residential character and landscaping of the adjacent sidewalk and parking areas are proposed. Services would be provided by the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

"It is proposed that the housing would provide a relocation facility for persons displaced from the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project; and the project has been approved by the Mission Model Neighborhood in which area it is located.



September 16, 1971

"The immediate neighborhood is a mixture of residential, commercial and industrial uses. Facing the subject property on Mission Street is the National Guard Armory. Low-density dwellings occupy the east side of Minna Street. Dwellings and commercial uses occupy the area between Mission and Minna south of the subject parcel. To the north are dwellings and industrial uses. Valencia Gardens Public Housing Project is at 15th and Valencia Streets to the west. Shopping facilities and public transit are provided in the general neighborhood."

Commissioner Mellon asked if the dwelling units would have individual kitchens. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative but indicated that the project would also contain centralized dining, laundry and recreational facilities.

The Director recommended that the density of the proposed project be approved as appropriate for the neighborhood and suitable to meet a demonstrated housing need of the City, subject to approval of the rear yard and parking variances by the Zoning Administrator and further subject to the condition that the available open areas adjacent to the subject building be attractively landscaped and maintained.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the proposed project.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6756 be adopted and that density of the project be approved as appropriate for the neighborhood and suitable to meet the housing needs of the city, subject to approval of the rear yard and parking variances by the Zoning Administrator, and further subject to the condition that the available open areas adjacent to the subject building be attractively landscaped and maintained.

At 5:40 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 5:50 p.m. to hear the remainder of the agenda. Commissioner Fleishhacker was absent from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

#### PRESENTATION OF IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION.

Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, presented and summarized the report which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. After the report has been distributed throughout the community, public hearings will be held on October 20, November 17 and December 1, 1971, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 23, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 23, 1971, at 100 Larkin Street, at 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); James White, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Sam Blumenfeld represented the San Francisco Examiner.

1:00 P.M. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on October 7, 1971.

2:15 P.M., 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of August 26, 1971 be approved as submitted.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board had held a public meeting on Wednesday afternoon to receive comments from the public regarding the proposed establishment of a Jackson Square Historic District.

The Director reported that he had attended a general meeting of the League of Women Voters on Wednesday to discuss methods of effectuating plans.



The Director informed the Commission that he will welcome the planning delegates to the annual convention of the League of California Cities next Monday.

The Director advised the Commission that he will meet with the San Francisco Labor Council next Monday evening to discuss the Urban Design Plan.

The Director announced that the City Planning Commission and the Port Commission, meeting jointly, will hold a public hearing on October 28 to receive comments regarding plans and proposals for the Waterfront from Aquatic Park to the County Line along the Bay. A map is now on display in the main hallway at 100 Larkin Street which indicates all of the plans and proposals made to date.

After questions had been raised about additional plans for the Waterfront which are currently being prepared by private groups or individuals, the Director stated that such plans would be accepted as public comments and would be evaluated by the Department of City Planning and the Port along with other comments which will be made at the Public Hearing.

#### CONSIDERATION OF LOBOS CREEK SCHOOL SITE IN THE PRESIDIO

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on this matter as follows:

"Consideration by the Board of Education of school sites in the Presidio date back to June 5, 1964, when it approved a resolution authorizing an application for Federal assistance to provide educational facilities for Presidio-based children. On October 2, 1967, the Department of City Planning was advised by the Superintendent of Schools that an agreement had been reached with the Presidio authorities to lease the 10-acre Lobos Creek site and the 10.5 acre El Polin site for school construction. Subsequently, on February 3, 1969, the General Administrative Officer of the School District and neighborhood residents requested the Department of City Planning to review the acceptability of the two Presidio locations for school development. On May 6, 1969, the report of the Department of City Planning was given to the Superintendent of Schools indicating that the Lobos Creek site appeared to be appropriate but questioned the acceptability of the El Polin site unless specific design terms of reference were met. A committee of the Commission was formed to review the matter and on May 29, 1969, submitted a report to the full Commission which recommended that the Lobos Creek site be developed first and that alternatives to the El Polin site within the Presidio be explored.

"On July 3, 1969, and again on July 17, 1969, the Commission voted to recommend that the Lobos Creek school site was acceptable and should be built on first. In the July 17, 1969 meeting the Commission also voted to declare the El Polin site acceptable provided certain design terms of reference were met.



September 23, 1971

"In the special meeting of the Commission on July 8, 1970, wherein the El Polin site was found unacceptable, the suggestion was made that consideration be given to the appropriateness of locating a school on the Lobos Creek site. A motion was passed asking the Director to give consideration to alternate sites for the school for the Presidio giving particular attention to the Lobos Creek site so that the Commission could decide if it should hold further public hearings to consider the desirability of an alternate site.

"On July 12, 1971, Colonel John L. Fellows, Jr., Commanding Officer of the Presidio, by letter to President Newman, requested that the Commission by formal resolution express its position on the proposed Lobos Creek school site.

"The Lobos Creek school site is a good location for a school in the Presidio and has been so recognized by the Commission in the past. The site is along Lobos Creek and is virtually flat. The northernmost edge is a steep slope with some vegetation. The proposal for a school on this site includes 38 classrooms, related administrative space and playgrounds.

"The following are the staff recommendations for the development of a school facility on this site:

"Three changes in the site would allow a better plan.

- "1. Large areas of parking are immediately adjacent to this site at the 'Reserve Center.' If an agreement for use of this parking space can be reached with the Army, less parking would be required in the new development.
- "2. The eastern property line arbitrarily cuts across a flat open field. No other area will have access to the remaining flat area due to the topography. The site should be expanded to include all of this level area. This would allow more playfields and the development of what is a continuous area, as a complete landscaping plan.
- "3. Secondary access will be required by the Fire Department. The only feasible means is to come from Lincoln Boulevard to the north side of the site. To cut a road through this hill will be a difficult and expensive task. If the Fire Department would accept, with Army agreement, an access road through the Reserve Center, it would save much money and be the most environmentally economical solution.



September 23, 1971

"Mass/Height. The plan for this school should be limited to two-story structures. The roof of these structures will be highly visible and should be consciously designed to be seen: Utilities should be grouped (sometimes screened), and the material/color and form chosen to enhance the view of these roofs.

"The slope at the northern edge of the site is of an unstable, sand base soil. The trees along this slope are easily susceptible to loss when this soil is disturbed. Buildings should not be near the slope, nor near any trees that are to be preserved.

"The contractor should be held responsible for preservation of trees during construction.

"Landscaping. Playfields should be grassed (as opposed to paved) wherever possible.

"Fencing should be minimized and, where access control structures are unavoidable, these should be handled as changes in level, integrated with the steep slope, or constructed with landscaping.

"Tall trees (poplar, eucalyptus) should be used around/between buildings to further screen views of these buildings from the residents above.

"However, given the present state of information as to the contribution of this school to the city-wide school system considering the implications of the Field Act on present school facilities, the proposed fifty-six million dollar school bond issue program, accessibility factors because of bussing, and presently publicized decreases in child population in San Francisco, the staff is not prepared to say at this time that a school in the Presidio is or is not appropriate and believes that the establishment of the need for a school at this particular site is fundamentally the responsibility of the Board of Education."

At the conclusion of his report, the Director recommended that the Commission endorse the memorandum which he had just read and that it ask him to send a letter to Colonel Fellows informing him of the endorsement with a copy of the letter to the Board of Education.

Commissioner Finn, pointing out that eucalyptus trees are shallow-rooted, brittle, and dirty, stated that he did not feel that they should be used around or between school buildings as recommended in the staff memorandum. He stated that he would have no objections to use of poplar trees in such areas. The Director suggested that the memorandum might be reworded to call for the planting of "tall trees" around or between the school buildings, leaving the variety of trees to be used unspecified.



September 23, 1971

President Newman, noting that the Master Plan for the Presidio had been modified to eliminate any new housing, asked if the school presently under consideration would be used exclusively for school children from the Presidio or if it would be used for children living outside the Presidio as well. The Director replied that the staff of the Department of City Planning had directed a similar question to the Board of Education; and, in a written reply, Philip Cali, Director of the Facilities, Planning and Construction Division of the Board of Education, had responded that the Board of Education had requested the Department of the Army to modify clause 30 of its lease with the school district which stated that children of other than Department of Defense personnel shall be placed in the school only on a space available basis. Mr. Cali had further stated that he believed that the clause would be deleted from the lease; if so, and in the light of the desegregation plan within the school district, approximately one-half of the space within the school would be available for children who live outside of the Presidio.

President Newman asked if all of the children living on the Presidio would be accommodated within the proposed school. The Director replied that it was his understanding that at least 50% of the children living on the Presidio would be bussed to schools located elsewhere.

Larry Jacobson, School Needs Analyst for the Board of Education, confirmed that the court order now in effect would require the bussing of 50% of the children living on the Presidio. If and when bussing becomes a thing of the past, all of the children living on the Presidio could be accommodated in the proposed school, since the Presidio has indicated that its housing stock will remain constant.

Commissioner Porter noted that many schools in San Francisco have been closed because of the Field Act; and, under the circumstances, she wondered if it would not be more advisable to construct new facilities in residential neighborhoods, such as on the Grant School site, rather than in the Presidio. Mr. Jacobson confirmed that there is a need for additional school facilities in the Richmond District to replace the buildings which have been closed because of the Field Act; however, since the Lobos Creek site is located adjacent to a residential neighborhood, it would be accessible to school children living in the area who do not have to be bussed to other schools.

Commissioner Fleishhacker did not feel that the Commission should become involved in the bussing issue; rather, he believed that the role of the Commission should be limited to a determination as to whether the subject site is appropriate for school use, with or without conditions, if a decision is made by the Board of Education that a school is needed in the Presidio. The Director made it clear that he was not prepared to say whether or not a school should be located in the Presidio; however, if a decision is reached that construction of a school in the Presidio is necessary, then he felt that the subject site would be a suitable location for the facility.



September 23, 1971

Commissioner Porter asked if the school buildings which have been closed because of the Field Act will be abandoned. Mr. Jacobson stated that the Board of Education is developing a Master Plan to deal with the buildings which have been closed. Some of the buildings will definitely be reconstructed; but decisions on others had been deferred for various reasons such as the location of the buildings, the absence of nearby school children, etc.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Board of Education should decide whether a school is needed in the Presidio before action is taken by the City Planning Commission regarding the appropriateness of the subject site for such a facility.

Commissioner Rueda asked how many students could be accommodated in the 38 classrooms being proposed for the subject site. Mr. Jacobson replied that the school could have an enrollment of 900 children.

Commissioner Ritchie recalled that Mayor Alioto, at the time of the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Presidio, had stated that construction of any new buildings in the Presidio would be accompanied by removal of existing buildings; and he asked which buildings would be removed if the proposed school were to be constructed.

The Director replied that the Memorandum of Understanding had not included such an equivalency clause. However, he indicated that an amendment which would incorporate such a clause into the Memorandum of Understanding is presently under consideration.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Commission should defer action on the matter presently under consideration until a decision is reached on the proposed amendment of the Memorandum of Understanding.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that it was obvious that any agreement between the City and the Presidio on the equivalency clause would require that existing buildings in the Presidio be removed if a new school should be constructed on the Lobos Creek site in the future.

President Newman felt that the Commission's decision on the appropriateness of the subject site for school use should not be influenced by the possibility that the equivalency clause might be incorporated into the Memorandum of Understanding in the future.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had previously presumed that the proposed school would be located more easterly and northerly on the subject site; and he pointed out that the location now being proposed would block public access to the open area which lies to the east. He also asked about the role of the subject site in the proposed Golden Gate Headlands National Recreation Area which is presently being considered in Washington.



September 23, 1971

The Director stated that it was his understanding that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of Interior had advised the Board of Education that the non-wooded portion of the Lobos Creek School site is within a particular area tentatively scheduled for institutional use.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Rueda and seconded by Commissioner Finn that the memorandum which had been prepared by the Director of Planning be endorsed and that the Director be asked to send a letter to Colonel Fellows, informing him of such with a copy of the letter to the Board of Education.

President Newman asked if there were any possibility that an agreement might be reached during the next week regarding the equivalency clause. Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, replied that he had no current information on the likelihood of the Army's response.

Commissioner Finn, as an act of courtesy to Commissioner Ritchie, withdrew his second of Commissioner Rueda's motion so that the matter could be taken under advisement for one week.

The Director pointed out that the equivalency clause, if approved, would be binding only on the Sixth Army and not on the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, Letterman General Hospital, the Board of Education or other public jurisdictions which may control land within the Presidio.

Commissioner Fleishhacker noted that Colonel Fellows had written on July 12, 1971, to request the Commission to express its position on the proposed Lobos Creek School Site; and, since more than two months had elapsed since that time, he felt that a reply should be made as soon as possible. If the Commission were concerned about the application of any equivalency clause which might be agreed to in the future, he pointed out that it could act to recommend that the clause, if adopted, should apply to the proposed school if it is to be built.

After further discussion, Commissioner Rueda withdrew his motion.

President Newman concluded that the consensus of the Commission was that it would be willing to defer action on the matter for one week.

Mrs. Meyer, speaking on behalf of the Bay Area Chapter of the Sierra Club, advised the Commission that the Lobos Creek site was considered by that organization to be a part of the City's open space inventory. On behalf of people for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, she noted that two bills are presently pending before Congress, both of which would result in the establishment of a Golden Gate Headlands Park. One of the bills would call for preservation of undeveloped open space such as the Lobos Creek site; and the second bill would provide that existing buildings must be removed whenever new buildings are constructed on vacant land. She also noted that the Board of Supervisors, acting last spring, had taken a strong position favoring the inclusion of certain portions of the Presidio, notably the Lobos Creek site, in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.



September 23, 1971

Miss Gibbons, a resident of the Richmond District, felt that no action should be taken regarding the proposed construction of a school on the Lobos Creek site until action has been taken by Congress on the bills calling for the establishment of a Golden Gate Headlands National Recreational Area.

Louis Lowenstein, indicated that he concurred with the position which had been taken by Commissioner Ritchie. If the Commission were to take the position that the site would be ideal for construction of a school, its action could be taken to imply that a school should be constructed on the site. In order to clarify the intent of the actual action which had been recommended by the Director of Planning, he felt that the following statement, included at the end of the staff memorandum, should be moved to the front of the memorandum for emphasis:

"The staff is not prepared to say at this time that a school in the Presidio is or is not appropriate and believes that the establishment of the need for a school at this particular site is fundamentally the responsibility of the Board of Education."

Virginia Ryder, Director of the San Francisco School District's Science Center, informed the Commission that a program of environmental education had been initiated last spring; and she stated that Lobos Creek, the only stream of its sort in the City, is an extremely valuable aid for teaching children about snakes, amphibians and birds. She hoped that it would be left in its natural state.

Robert Lilienthal, 1 Spruce Street, stated that he had received notice that discussion of the Lobos Creek site would be included on the Commission's agenda only two days ago; and, as a result, he had not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors. He did not feel that a decision should be made on the appropriateness of the site for school purposes until a city-wide Master Plan element has been prepared by professional planners to justify the need for additional school buildings in specific locations.

President Newman announced that further consideration of this matter would be scheduled for the Commission's next regular meeting on September 30, 1971.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary



SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 30, 1971.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 30, 1971, at 2:00 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Planner V (Zoning); Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning); Emily Hill, Planner II; George Faltico, Planner II; Russell Watson, Planner I; James White, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Ralph Craib represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of September 2, 1971, be approved as submitted.

## CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning had met on Tuesday afternoon with community leaders from the Sunset district to discuss alternative approaches for providing a cross-Sunset transit line.

The Director informed the Commission that he had sent a letter to the City Attorney, in accordance with an instruction previously made by the Commission, asking that specific notice be given to the State Department of the R-2 zoning standards applicable to the property at 2790 Green Street and of the possible violation of those standards by the Russian Government which may occur under rumored use by them of that property.

The Director called attention to the fact that next week's Regular Meeting will begin either at 1:30 p.m. or at 1:45 p.m.

The Director recommended that a draft resolution which he had prepared be adopted to add Gerald J. Connors, Jr., the Department's new Junior Management Assistant, to the list of staff members eligible to sign revolving fund checks for the Department of City Planning. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner



Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6757.

Consideration of Lobos Creek School Site in the Presidio.  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of September 23, 1971).

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, distributed copies of a revised staff memorandum on this matter to the members of the Commission. As suggested by a member of the audience at last week's meeting, the following remarks had been moved from the end to the beginning of the memorandum: "It should be made clear that the Commission is not taking a position at this time regarding the need for a school at the Lobos Creek site. This is a fundamental responsibility of the Board of Education; and, although the Commission has the authority to give an advisory recommendation on such matters, the staff at this time is not prepared to so recommend one way or another. Rather, the staff's recommendation to the City Planning Commission concerns site utilization if a school facility is placed thereon."

The revised memorandum also deleted reference to the specific type of trees which should be used around or between buildings to further screen them from adjacent residential buildings.

During the interim, the staff of the Department of City Planning had contacted the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation relative to the status of the Lobos Creek school site in the proposed National Recreation Area; and the staff had been informed that the Bureau's recommendations on the National Recreation Area had been sent to the Department of the Interior. Since the Secretary of the Interior had not released any information on the subject, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation did not feel free to take a position which might preempt the Secretary's position.

The staff of the Department of City Planning had also contacted the Mayor's Office regarding the status of a proposed amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding which would provide that existing buildings would be removed whenever new buildings are constructed in the Presidio. The Mayor's Office had indicated that the Army is actively reviewing the proposal. While a response might be forthcoming from the Army within a month, the timing of the reply will be entirely at the discretion of the Army.

The Director remarked that the staff memorandum had indicated that the Lobos Creek site would be a good location for a school in the Presidio if certain specific conditions were observed in the development of such a facility; and, he noted that the recommendation which he had made during the meeting of September 23, 1971, was that the Commission should endorse the memorandum and instruct him to send a letter to Colonel Fellows informing him of such with a copy of the letter to be sent to the Board of Education. He stated that his recommendation on the matter remained the same.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the subject property had been designated as part of the open space which might be included in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The Director replied that it was his understanding that the property had been recommended for inclusion in the proposed recreation area.



Commissioner Porter informed the Commission that at least one private property in Sea Cliff extends to the center line of Lobos Creek.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that he had visited the area to view the wild life which had been mentioned by a member of the audience at last week's meeting; and he had not even been able to find the creek. In any case, he understood that the site presently under consideration did not include the creek.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the size of the subject site and what the size of the adjacent flat area which was being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning for addition to the school property.

Martin Rosse, site architect for the Lobos Creek school, replied that the property under lease to the school district contains ten acres; the parcel to the east contains approximately four acres.

Commissioner Ritchie then asked if the property line of the site under lease to the Board of Education extends to the center line of Lobos Creek. James White, Planner II, replied that the boundaries of the site lie between 100 and 150 ft. north of the creek. In reply to a question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. White indicated that the creek does not appear to be accessible to the public at the present time.

President Newman asked if the Board of Education planned to initiate construction of the school immediately if the site should be found acceptable by the City Planning Commission. Larry Jacobson, School Needs Analyst for the Board of Education, stated that present plans are to begin construction early in 1973. In reply to a further question raised by President Newman as to whether the Master Plan of the Board of Education calls for construction of a school on the subject site, Mr. Jacobson stated that the Board of Education had counted on a new school in the Presidio to meet its needs for classroom space in that area of the City.

President Newman then asked about the Board of Education's plans for the Alamo and Grant schools.

Mr. Jacobson replied that the Grant school will be vacated; and the property on which it is located, two-thirds of which belongs to the City, will be disposed of by the Board of Education. The Alamo school will be modernized and reconstructed.

President Newman asked what approach might be taken by the Board of Education if the City Planning Commission were to decide that the Lobos Creek school site is not appropriate for school use. Mr. Jacobson stated that the Board of Education would probably have to submit another bond issue to the electorate to provide funds for construction of a new school outside of the Presidio; and, if such a bond issue should fail, space problems in the schools would become even more serious in 1975 when additional schools are scheduled to be closed.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Lobos Creek site was considered to be especially desirable for school use because of its size. Mr. Jacobson replied in the affirmative. In response to another question raised by Commissioner Porter,



he indicated that under present policies of the Board of Education one-half of the children living in the Presidio would attend the proposed school while the remainder of the children would be bussed to other facilities. The remainder of the school would be available to civilian children.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if it would be possible to construct a new school on property presently occupied by the Grant, Madison, or Alamo schools instead of on the Lobos Creek site. Mr. Jacobson replied that the Board of Education would then lose money in the amount of \$528,000 which the Federal government had agreed to make available for construction of a school in the Presidio.

Commissioner Ritchie did not feel that the City should allow the possible loss of a half million dollars to justify construction of a school on an inappropriate site. After Mr. Jacobson had emphasized that the Lobos Creek site, which comprises ten acres of land as opposed to the usual one acre of land available to other schools in the City, is an ideal site for a school, Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the logical extension of such an argument would be to place a number of schools in the Presidio. While any school which might be constructed on the subject site would be exceptional as compared with other schools in San Francisco, it would deprive the public of a valuable piece of open space.

Mr. Jacobson stated that the playground of the school could be used for public recreation after school hours; and he indicated that the school's auditorium could be used for public meetings.

Commissioner Ritchie wondered how accessible the playground would be if it were to be fenced. The Director pointed out that one of the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning was that fencing of the site should be minimized.

Commissioner Mellon asked about the total estimated cost of the proposed school. Mr. Rosse replied that the cost of the school would be approximately \$1.5 million, exclusive of land cost. He indicated that the Board of Education has a 25-year lease on the site; and he remarked that it was conceivable that the property could be reconverted for park use when the lease expires.

Mr. Jacobson, in reply to a further question raised by Commissioner Mellon, stated that the Board of Education's General Fund would contribute \$1 million towards cost of the facility with the remainder to be contributed by the Department of Health Education and Welfare.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Rueda that the Commission endorse the staff memorandum and that it ask the Director to send a letter to Colonel Fellows informing him of such with a copy of the letter to be sent to the Board of Education.

Commissioner Ritchie again asked for clarification as to whether the subject property had been recommended as part of the open space to be included in the Golden Gate National Recreation area. The Director stated that a resolution which is presently pending before the Board of Education contains the following language:



"Several staff members of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., and the Pacific Southwest Regional Office of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in San Francisco, were contacted in order to ascertain the current status of the Golden Gate National Recreation area report. It was pointed out that the report consists of Department of the Interior staff recommendations and that implementation will require legislation by the Congress; but for the purposes of SFUSD planning the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has indicated that the non-wooded portion of the Lobos Creek school site is within a particular area tentatively scheduled for institutional use." In any case, whereas the Golden Gate Headlands National Park proposal had been made only recently, an action taken by the City Planning Commission approximately two years ago had indicated that the Lobos Creek site would be acceptable for school use.

Commissioner Mellon pointed out that national parks, national forests, and national recreation areas throughout the country contain many different kinds of structures; and he did not feel that construction of the school on the subject site would prevent the property from being included in a national recreation area.

Commissioner Rueda asked how many children of school age are presently housed in the Presidio and whether they are being bussed to schools at the present time. Mr. Jacobson replied that approximately 800 students presently reside in the Presidio; and, since the Army does not intend to increase its housing supply in the Presidio, he assumed that the number of children would not change significantly in the future. He stated that students from the Presidio are being bussed to three elementary schools at the present time. The proposed school would have a capacity of approximately 900 students; and it was hoped that 450 of the students to be accommodated would be able to walk to the facility while the remaining 450 students would be bussed elsewhere.

Commissioner Finn informed the Commission that the Public Utilities Commission had had considerable experience with national recreation area administration at Hetch Hetchy and on the Peninsula watershed land; and he advised the Commission that any institutional use, such as the one proposed, would be reviewed by the Department of the Interior if the subject property is included in the proposed Golden Gate National Recreation area.

Fred Selinger remarked that Section 30 of the lease between the Army and the school district specified that any school to be built on the site should be for the use of military children and that civilian children should be accommodated only on a space available basis. Yet, he pointed out that the recent court order requiring integration of the City's schools would require violation of that lease provision.

The Director stated that the draft resolution presently being considered by the Board of Education contains the following resolve: "That no final decision be made at this time as to the application of district-wide integration policies to the pupils located in the Presidio and that such decision await the report of the Citizen's Committee on Integration of the School District." He felt that the intention of the Board of Education was that no more than 50% of the students to be accommodated in the school should be from the Presidio. Mr. Jacobson stated that it was his understanding that the Army and the school district are close to



reaching an agreement under which the proposed school would, in every respect, be treated as a part of the San Francisco school system.

Emily Meyer, Co-chairman of People for a Golden Gate National Recreation area, stated that the Lobos Creek site had been part of the open space which had been recommended for inclusion in the new recreation area; and she felt that "whittling away" of the proposed recreation area before final legislation is enacted in Washington would compromise the principle of preserving open space. She distributed copies of the latest edition of Time magazine which contained a full-page advertisement detailing the scope and scale of the proposed recreation area; and she felt that Time's decision to donate the advertising space testified to the substantial backing which is being given to establishment of the recreation area. She estimated that legislation establishing the recreation area will be passed within one year; and she believed that a decision on the proposed school should be postponed until that time. In any case, she did not feel that 14 acres of open space should be destroyed merely for the purpose of obtaining \$500,000 from the Federal government for construction of a new school.

Joyce Haerr, 120 23rd Avenue, stated that she had written to her Congressman in July to inquire why the Lobos Creek site had been chosen for the proposed school when so many other sites are available; and she had received a letter from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare stating that the location of the school is a matter to be determined locally in accordance with State regulations. Under the circumstances, she did not understand why the school could not be constructed on property presently occupied by other schools which have been vacated. She stated that the property in the vicinity of Lobos Creek has been affected by slides; and, as a result, she felt that it would be a hazardous location for a school in case of an earthquake. Furthermore, since she obtains a great deal of enjoyment from the Presidio in its present state, she hoped that the Lobos Creek site would not be disturbed by construction of a school.

Commissioner Porter asked Mrs. Haerr if she would object to construction of a school on another site in the Presidio. Mrs. Haerr indicated that she would not object to construction of a school on another site presently occupied by other buildings; however, she did not feel that open space should be used for construction of the proposed facility.

Kenneth Hunter, 604 40th Avenue, observed that the possibility of losing the \$528,000 grant from the Federal government seemed to be the major reason that the Board of Education was anxious to obtain permission for construction of a school on the subject site. He noted that the Federal grant had been made contingent on location of the school in the Presidio; however, in view of the impact on the school system of the recent court order for integration, and in view of the possible creation of a Golden Gate National Recreation area, he felt that the Federal government should be willing to reconsider the terms of the grant. In any case, he felt that the Board of Education should make an effort to inquire whether the Federal government would be willing to revise the terms of the grant so that the money could be used for reconstruction of other nearby schools. While he realized that the size of the subject site might make it attractive for school purposes, he questioned whether San Francisco, with its limited space, can afford suburban type school facilities.



He also remarked that the recent decline in the birth rate may have a profound effect on school facilities in the future. He believed that a direct attempt had been made to obtain approval for the proposed school before the Golden Gate National Recreation area is established; and he felt that action on the proposal should be postponed until the recreation area has been achieved.

Commissioner Mellon pointed out that the Commission, by adopting the motion which had been made by Commissioner Fleishhacker, would not be taking the position that any school should be built on the Lobos Creek site. Rather, the Commission would be taking the position that the site would be appropriate for school use, subject to certain specific conditions, if the Board of Education should determine that a school is needed in the Presidio.

Commissioner Fleishhacker emphasized that the Board of Education had been considering school sites in the Presidio since June 5, 1964; and, under the circumstances, he did not feel that it would be fair to say that an attempt had been made to rush the proposed school through before action has been taken on the proposal to establish a Golden Gate National Recreation area.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5-2 to endorse the memorandum which had been prepared by the staff and to request the Director to send a letter to Colonel Fellows informing him of such with a copy of the letter to be sent to the Board of Education. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioners Newman and Ritchie voted "No."

Discretionary Review of Building Application No. 401899 for Standard Oil Building, Southside of Market East of Second Street.

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV-Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"This Building Application is scheduled for review by the City Planning Commission under its discretionary powers on September 30, 1971, for two reasons. Commission Resolution No. 6111, adopted in June, 1967, calls for review of all building projects along Market Street. In addition, Resolution No. 6746, adopted August 26, 1971, put into effect a system of interim height and bulk controls for the city that requires review of a building at the proposed location if it is to exceed 400 feet in height.

"The applicant is the Standard Oil Company of California, which proposes a new office building adjacent to its existing building at 555 Market Street, to be occupied entirely by the component companies of Standard Oil. There would be no increase in employment, but employees would be consolidated in the new offices from a number of downtown buildings in which Standard Oil now rents space. The architects are Hertzka and Knowles, who designed the 555 Market Street building.

"The building would be just west of the existing Standard Oil Plaza, running through from Market to Stevenson and occupying the land now covered by two small buildings that have housed a furniture store and a toy and novelty firm.



"In its over-all form, the building is a slender tower that maintains the Market Street facade line and rises to 39 stories and 551 feet. This height is slightly greater than that of the Aetna Building (529 feet) and the recently-approved Tishman-Cahill and Metropolitan Buildings (529 and 524 feet, respectively), but it is less than that of the Wells Fargo Building (561 feet). The proposal would therefore be consistent in height with other development at this central location in the office core, adjacent to the Montgomery Street transit station.

"In its bulk, the building would be considerably within the limits of the Urban Design Plan. The tower measures 82 by 154 feet, with a diagonal dimension of 175 feet, as compared with the Urban Design Plan limits of 170 feet for length of walls and 200 feet for the diagonal dimension.

"The facade would be identical with that of the 555 Market Street building, with terra cotta of light color as the principal material and granite at the ground level. All four elevations would have windows, including the west side on which the elevator core projects from the main part of the building.

"Gross floor area at each of the office floors is 13,511 square feet, with a total floor area in the building of 535,768 square feet. The floor area ratio is computed by taking the combined floor areas of this building and 555 Market Street, as compared with the total site of 54,363 square feet. These figures yield a relatively modest ratio of 15.05:1, which is less than the ratio of 17.35:1 actually permitted by the base ratio plus the bonuses afforded by the building design.

"The features for which bonuses would be given are proximity to rapid transit, multiple building entrances, the side setback between buildings, and the ground level open space. Although a large plaza is provided, the bonus awarded to it is rather small, due to the fact that most of the plaza is not readily accessible for the public. A question has also been raised as to the effect of the new building upon sunlight to the square, although the effect would be only slightly more adverse than that of the existing 54-foot building on the site which now shades the plaza throughout the afternoon. If the plaza were intended primarily for walking and sitting, sunlight would be of even greater importance.

"During the past six weeks, in response to comments of the Department of City Planning staff, Standard Oil and its architects have increased the amount of retail space at ground level in the proposed building, and have provided an arcaded area with viewpoints for enjoyment of the flower displays that are placed in the sunken plaza. Two shops would be at the front of the building, with a third farther back, and the office building lobby would be de-emphasized in favor of the pedestrian amenities.



"Additional off-street truck loading berths would be provided as required by the Planning Code, supplementing the loading area the 555 Market Street building which would be joined to the new building by a tunnel. No additional garage area for automobiles would be provided.

"If approval is given to this application, it should be with the following conditions:

1. That the design of all exterior ground areas be further reviewed with the staffs of the Department of City Planning and Transit Task Force, so that paving, landscaping, signs and other features will be consistent with and complementary to the treatment of Market Street.
2. That the ground floor shops be of the size shown or larger, and that these shops be occupied by activities that will provide goods and services for the convenience of the general public in the area.
3. That the facades be similar in color and materials to the facades of the 555 Market Street building, unless an alternative facade treatment is specifically approved by the City Planning Commission."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, remarked that the proposed building would be completely within the height and bulk guidelines contained in the Urban Design Plan; and, in addition, the applicants had been willing to provide ground level commercial space within the building. He recommended that a draft resolution which he had prepared be adopted to approve the application subject to the three conditions which had been mentioned by Mr. Svirsky.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if there would be any connection between the existing building and the proposed building. A representative of the firm of Hertzka and Knowles, architects for the applicant, replied that employees and visitors wishing to go from one building to the other would have to go outdoors.

Francis Sitek, representing the Standard Oil Company of California, replied that the employees to be housed in the new building would be working for independent operating companies and would not have any need for the services or facilities housed in the existing building. He indicated, however, that a tunnel for use by service personnel including maintenance men and mailmen, would be constructed to link the two buildings. In constructing the tunnel, the flower garden would be disturbed as little as possible.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the flower garden is nice to look at; but he remarked that it is apparently not open to the public. Mr. Sitek replied that the garden is open to the public; however, in order to protect the flowers, access to the garden is controlled.

Commissioner Porter and Commissioner Mellon complimented the Standard Oil Company for the beautiful way in which the flower garden has been maintained.



President Newman asked if he were correct in understanding that the Urban Design Plan had called for tall buildings to be located next to major transit facilities. After the Director had replied in the affirmative, President Newman asked if the Standard Oil Company had any present or future plans to connect its new building with the adjacent BART station. The Director replied in the negative, pointing out that an entrance to the transit station is located immediately outside the front door of the proposed building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, assuming that the conditions which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning were acceptable to the applicants, moved that the draft resolution be adopted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mellon.

Miss Heston, a member of the audience, objected to the proposed building. She believed that developers of such buildings had been instructed by the staff of the Department of City Planning not to release pictures or information concerning their buildings because of the Duskin Initiative; and she stated that the developer of the building presently under consideration had been quoted to that effect. In making such suggestions to developers, she felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning was stepping into the political arena and that it should be taken to task by the City Planning Commission. She noted that no photographs of the subject site were on display in the meeting room to show the height of other buildings in the area; and she felt that the rendering which had been prepared by the applicants did not bear any relation to reality.

The Director stated that the article which had recently been printed in the Progress and which had apparently been read by Miss Heston was completely inaccurate. The article had claimed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had advised the developers of the proposed Holiday Inn on Van Ness Avenue to avoid publicity concerning their project; however, since the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the building permit application for that building be denied, little motive would have existed for giving such advice to the developers. He stated that the Department of City Planning has no responsibility for advertising discretionary review hearings; however, whenever plans are submitted to the Department of City Planning, they are always available to the public for inspection. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not withheld any facts concerning the subject building from the public.

Robert Lilienthal, 1 Spruce Street, felt that a bad precedent would be established if the Commission were to allow surplus floor area ratio credits from the existing buildings to be applied to new buildings to be constructed on adjacent properties, as in the present case. While such arrangements would allow the proposed building to be 10% larger than would otherwise be the case, similar circumstances on other sites might have a serious detrimental effect.

Mr. Sitek stated that the properties on Market Street had been assembled by the Standard Oil Company in 1957 with the expectation that more space would be needed in the future than is available in the presently existing building.



Charles Saba stated that one of the daily newspapers had printed an article last Saturday which quoted a representative of the Standard Oil Company as saying that he had received orders from the chairman of his board of directors not to discuss the proposed building; and the article had indicated that no date had been set for discretionary review of the building by the City Planning Commission. Yet, the discretionary review had taken place within a few days of the article. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was obvious that an attempt was being made to rush the building through without public comment. If so, and if the building were to be approved, the net effect would probably be to encourage more voter support for the Duskin Initiative.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6758 and to approve Building Application No. 401899 subject to the three conditions which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

At 3:15 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:25 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU69.12 - Pacific Medical Center  
Request for approval of Master Plan for expansion  
of the Medical Center.  
(Under Advisement from Meeting of September 2, 1971).

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, read the following prepared statement:

"On September 2 the Commission continued the hearing of the proposed Pacific Medical Center Master Plan proposal to today to allow staff to prepare its recommendation. The Commission requested that during the intervening time staff consult with both representatives of the Medical Center and the adjacent residential neighborhood in preparing its recommendations.

"The staff has prepared a recommendation. The staff met with the representatives of the Medical Center at the Department office on September 8, in the field on September 8 and September 20, and again in the office on September 22 and September 29.

"Mr. Passmore attended a meeting with members of the neighborhood on September 15 and has consulted by telephone with representatives at various times since then, as well as meeting with members of SPUR who have been interested in this Master Plan.

"The staff has also consulted with the staff members of the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and the Bay Area Comprehensive Health Planning Council.



"The staff reviewed potential recommendations with the Commission's Zoning Committee on September 22 and suggestions of the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council received by the Department on September 21 were reviewed. Subsequently, a copy of those suggestions was sent to each commissioner.

"In summary those suggestions are 1) that the hospital buildings H-1 and H-2 be two floors lower than proposed in the Master Plan document submitted by the Center to the Commission on September 2; 2) that other buildings to be built on the site presently owned by the Center not exceed a height of 95 feet, the height of the existing dental building and a height generally related to existing higher residential buildings in this vicinity; 3) that a revised street pattern be developed to control traffic generated by the Medical Center; and 4) an entrance to a 24-hour parking garage on Buchanan Street not be permitted.

"With respect to the suggested lowering of the hospital buildings the Medical Center has submitted their arguments for retaining these floors in the Master Plan. These floors are basically required if a 500-bed hospital having 60 percent of the beds in single rooms as desired by the Medical Center is to be achieved. In connection with the garage entrance staff reviewed with the Medical Center administration and architects the precise needs for hospital truck loading facilities under construction and the floor layout of the first increment of the medical office and clinic building proposed on Buchanan Street that have resulted in the Center's proposal for ingress to a parking garage from Buchanan Street. Staff also has consulted with the Bureau of Traffic Engineering concerning possible modifications of the street pattern that would help control traffic circulation in the vicinity of the hospital.

"It is our belief that a 500-bed acute general hospital is a desirable use of the subject site, and that related teaching and research facilities are appropriate. In fact, as known, teaching facilities are required, under deed restrictions related to the site. The City Planning Commission has already approved 311 acute general care beds for the site and that building is under construction. Expansion to 500 beds allows for the flexibility required by the State Bureau of Hospitals for the construction of a new hospital, and the consolidation of outdated hospital beds now existing in San Francisco as recommended by the Bay Area Comprehensive Health Planning Council. Pacific Medical Center is already operating the 140-bed Garden Sullivan Hospital on Geary Boulevard, and that facility does need to be replaced. We have found that teaching hospitals generally need to provide at least 500 beds for a responsible medical training program; both U.C. Hospital and Stanford Hospital have been licensed for more than 500 beds.



The present 6-floor 311-bed hospital under construction has 13% of its beds in single occupancy rooms. The remainder of the beds will be in rooms containing two or more beds, many of these rooms, although meeting State Bureau of Hospital minimum standards for more than single bed occupancy, were originally designed functionally for single bed occupancy with the expectation of reallocation of beds when the two additional floors authorized by the Commission in 1969 were constructed.

"The building, both in terms of structure and mechanical elements, has been engineered for two additional floors at a substantial present construction investment greater than would have resulted for construction of only a six-floor building. We believe that retraction of the earlier Commission authorization of the additional two floors for this building would be more detrimental to the functional and financial ability of the hospital to provide desirable medical service to the public than the detrimental effect that the additional 32 feet of height will have on the surrounding residential neighborhood. The resulting additional height will be within the height limits proposed under the Urban Design Plan for this vicinity.

"However, we do not agree with the Medical Center that 60% single-bed occupancy is needed for the full 500-bed proposal. Thus we feel that the reduction of Building H-2 two floors in height, resulting in approximately 38% single-bed occupancy, will not be detrimental to the public service provided by this hospital. Such a reduction in height, although not as meaningful to the immediate neighborhood as the reduction of both Buildings H-1 and H-2, is still a worthwhile reduction in building bulk in relation to the lesser scale development existing and expected on properties surrounding the Medical Center.

"If we accept the appropriateness of a 500-bed teaching hospital at this location we cannot agree that all other buildings related to this hospital be reduced to a height of 95 feet. This would result in floor area having to be placed too far from major medical areas and service areas to be functionally acceptable and would require expansion of the Medical Center site to an extent that could result in adverse removal of residential properties. Office buildings designated as 'A-1 and A-2' are less than the suggested 95 feet in height, and we believe the new building 'D' proposed at the southeast corner of Webster and Sacramento Streets can be reduced without harm to the Center's public service to less than 95 feet in height. Although we would not require expansion of the Medical Center site to Fillmore Street we would strongly urge such expansion which might allow the reduction in the presently proposed heights of the buildings designated as C-1 and C-2. In any event the building designated C-2 at the western edge of the site cannot exceed a height of 160 feet and should be required to be a slender tower.



"Although, as a result of discussions with the neighborhood, staff felt that the elimination of the proposed Buchanan Street garage entrance would be desirable, we have been convinced by the Medical Center administration and architects that the elimination of this entrance is not possible. The only feasible truck loading area for the hospital is presently under construction in the former Clay Street right of way. The medical office and clinic building must be placed close to the hospital to operate functionally, and required retention of existing buildings to the west of the hospital until after the construction of a medical office building requires the placement of that building north of the hospital. The desirable building bulk guidelines to retain light and air for residential properties on Washington Street require that the stair and elevator core of the office building be placed at the southwest corner of the building allowing room for only a one-way automobile ramp unless the loading area under construction is removed. Numerous large truck deliveries throughout the day to the hospital could not be accomplished if the loading dock is removed. The present use of Webster Street for loading activities is undesirable, and unworkable in any case, as soon as the new hospital is occupied. Thus we are prepared to accept the Buchanan Street entrance, but do not believe it need be open on a 24-hour basis. Additionally we believe that improvements to Buchanan and Clay Streets in this vicinity can substantially reduce conflict with residential amenities resulting from the additional traffic this garage entrance would place on Buchanan Street.

"We have not been able to develop specific street pattern modifications as suggested by the neighborhood, but believe cul-de-sacs, street pavement width reduction, landscaping and appropriate directional signs can effectively control and visually screen traffic. However, there is no way that the traffic volumes on the street adjacent to the Medical Center can be retained at the present relatively low levels if this proposed Medical Center expansion is approved. This is a simple fact of life. We believe some through traffic currently on Webster and Buchanan Streets can be diverted from these streets, and Medical Center traffic can be deflected away from some of the adjacent residential streets. The means of doing this still requires review of precise plans by residents of the neighborhood and by other city departments such as Public Works, Police and Fire. We believe the installation and maintenance of such street improvement, once determined, should be the responsibility of Pacific Medical Center.

"The use of public parking provided by the Center, rather than use of residential curb parking, is an important element in the eventual compatibility of the Medical Center with the adjacent neighborhood. Thus, parking facilities must have conveniently located entrances, well laid out designated parking spaces, and desirable parking rates. Rates should be comparable to those charged by other hospitals in



residential areas, but should not be so low as to discourage use of public transit. Parking for employees should be subsidized although such subsidization should not result in labor contract competition between San Francisco hospitals.

"Wherever possible ground level open space should be landscaped to provide a transition between the greater building mass required functionally by medical centers and the lesser building mass existing and required in the residential neighborhood.

"Because the precise nature of the various program elements of the Medical Center are not to be determined at this time precise building plans must be prepared in consultation with the Department and approved by the Commission. Interested persons would thus be given the chance to review precise plans and make their comments known prior to approval for construction.

"In light of these comments and recognizing a possible conflict between the goals of providing good, desirable up-to-date medical services to the citizens of San Francisco, preventing the removal of land available for residential occupancy, and protecting the character of older sound residential areas from the intrusion of incompatible new buildings that must be considered in this case, the following resolution for approval of a Pacific Medical Center Master Plan has been prepared for your consideration."

The Director then distributed copies of the draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission and read and commented upon the 14 conditions which it contained.

The Director noted that he had mentioned at the Commission's previous hearing on this matter that it would be difficult if not impossible to meet everyone's requirements for the subject site. However, in preparing its recommendation, the staff of the Department of City Planning had tried its best to bring before the Commission proposals which would be consistent both with construction of a 500-bed Medical Center on the site and with protection and maintenance of the adjacent residential area.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the language of Condition No. 7 of the draft resolution would require the Medical Center to subsidize employee parking consistent with labor negotiated contracts of the employee industry, asked if the City Planning Commission actually has the authority to establish such a condition. The Director replied that he did not believe that it would be improper to include such language in the draft resolution; and he indicated that the language had been considered acceptable by the Medical Center. He pointed out that employee parking would inevitably spill over onto adjacent residential streets if no special provisions are made to encourage employees to park on the site.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the condition requiring the Medical Center to subsidize employee parking would fall outside of the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission. He also questioned the desirability of Condition No. 10 which



would require the Medical Center to post a performance bond to insure the installation of and maintenance of required landscaping since such a requirement would imply that the Commission does not trust the Pacific Medical Center. In addition, he felt that Condition No. 14, which would require approval by the Department of City Planning of procedures to be used by the Medical Center and its building contractors to control unreasonable noise, dust, and accumulation of trash caused by construction activity on the site, should be deleted and left to the Medical Center and their contractors to resolve.

President Newman, recalling that individuals who had spoken at the previous hearing had objected primarily to the traffic pattern indicated in the plans, asked if he was correct in understanding that the only condition contained in the draft resolution which would affect the traffic situation would be Condition No. 5 which would provide that access to the parking garage under Building 1-A from Buchanan shall be open only from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. Robert Passmore, Planner V-Zoning, stated that clause "G" of Condition No. 1 would provide that with the exception of the existing parking ingress and egress for the building designated "F" on the plans, no additional accommodation for vehicular ingress and egress for the Pacific Medical Center should be provided on Webster Street north of Clay Street. Subsection "I" of Condition No. 1 provided that the additional vehicular ingress and egress for the Medical Center may be provided on Sacramento Street upon the approval of the Department of City Planning and that such ingress or egress may be required by the Department to lessen the traffic load on Webster Street. Additional ingress and egress on Sacramento Street had not been specified as a definite requirement because the staff of the Department of City Planning had not yet had an opportunity to determine what effect the proposed Medical Center would have on traffic on Sacramento Street.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the Commission does have the authority to impose more restrictive conditions than normal when conditional use applications are approved; however, he joined with Commissioners Porter and Ritchie in questioning the advisability of requiring Pacific Medical Center to subsidize parking for its employees. Furthermore, even if the employee parking were to be subsidized, the employees might still prefer to park on the street unless the neighborhood were heavily posted with "No Parking" signs. He felt that specific reference to a performance bond could be deleted from Condition No. 10 insofar as other instruments might be equally effective in insuring that the required landscaping would be installed and maintained. He then asked if a parking garage would eventually be constructed beneath Building A-2 in addition to the garage which will be constructed under Building A-1; and, if so, he wondered if access to the parking garage under Building A-2 would be from Webster Street rather than from Buchanan Street. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative to both questions.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that it might be difficult to police access to the parking spaces between the two buildings if they were to be located in what would actually be one large garage. Also, since Building A-1 would probably be occupied as early as 8 a.m., he wondered why the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended, in Condition No. 5, that the garage beneath the building should not be opened until 9 a.m. Mr. Passmore stated that the garages under Buildings A-1 and A-2 would have to be separated in some manner. While the staff of the Department of City Planning felt that a total of 1400 parking spaces should be provided when the complex is completed, a sufficient number of parking spaces would be



required during the interim to meet the code requirements for each individual building. He stated that the hours of operation of the garage beneath Building A-1 had not been discussed with the Pacific Medical Center.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that provision of 1400 parking spaces on the site might conflict with the stated objective of encouraging employees of the Medical Center to use public transit rather than private automobiles; and, in any case, 1400 parking spaces would attract a great number of automobiles to the area. Mr. Passmore stated that the staff recommendation for a total of 1400 parking spaces would constitute an increase of only 200 parking spaces over the number technically required for the facility by the City Planning Code.

Commissioner Mellon questioned the advisability of requiring the Pacific Medical Center to subsidize parking for its employees, particularly since the City and County of San Francisco, which has approximately 20,000 employees, is itself engaged in the construction of a new hospital complex (San Francisco General Hospital). In any case, subsidized parking would certainly not encourage the employees of the Medical Center to use public transit.

The Director noted that the staff of the Department of City Planning, in recognition of the fact that any subsidization of the parking spaces at the proposed Medical Center should be consistent with the practice followed at other hospitals in San Francisco, had specified in Condition No. 7 that the subsidization for employee parking at the proposed facility should be "consistent with labor negotiated contracts of the employee industry." He emphasized that employee parking would inevitably spill over onto adjacent residential streets unless on-site parking spaces are provided at a price which the employees can afford; and, in view of the size of the proposed project, parking congestion in the subject neighborhood could become as serious as the parking problems presently being experienced in certain neighborhoods which lie adjacent to local colleges unless proper steps are taken to encourage on-site employee parking.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he lives in a neighborhood which lies adjacent to a college campus; and, while parking problems in the area are quite serious, he felt that more of the students are presently using public transportation than would be the case if free parking were to be provided for them on the campus. Furthermore, since the issue of subsidized parking for employees is directly related to employer-employee relations, he felt that it would be beyond the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission to adopt a condition requiring the Pacific Medical Center to provide subsidized parking for its employees; and, in addition, he felt that adoption of the requirement would set a dangerous precedent for the future.

Commissioner Ritchie agreed with Commissioner Mellon and recommended that the requirement for subsidized parking be deleted from Condition No. 7. He also suggested that specific reference to a performance bond should be deleted from Condition No. 10.

Commissioner Porter stated that she found nothing offensive about the requirement for posting of a performance bond by the Medical Center; and, since the Medical Center itself had agreed to the condition, she felt that the requirement should remain in the draft resolution. After discussion, Commissioner Ritchie agreed that Condition No. 10 of the draft resolution should not be changed.



Commissioner Rueda noted that Subsection "e" of Condition No. 1 of the draft resolution specified that the building designated C-2 on the plans should be reduced to a maximum height of 160 feet; and he wondered what the original height of the building had been. Mr. Passmore stated that the height of the building had previously been indicated at 180 feet.

Commissioner Rueda then noted that Subsection "b" of Condition No. 1 provided that "no new construction on the site area designated 'D' under the plan shall be higher than the base of the dome of the adjacent congregation Sherith Israel Temple to the south or approximately --- feet above the grade of Webster Street at the center of the Webster Street property line of said site." He asked what figure would be inserted in the blank. Mr. Passmore replied that the height of the base of the dome had not yet been measured. Under present circumstances, a specific figure would not actually be needed since the height of the base of the dome is apparent; however, if the building should be torn down at a later date, it would be desirable to have a specific reference point cited in the Commission's resolution.

Clifford Schwarberg, President of the Pacific Medical Center, stated that his reaction to the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning was generally positive; and he believed that those recommendations had been made in the best interests of the neighborhood, the City, and the Pacific Medical Center. Referring to a working model of the proposed complex, he illustrated how the recommendations which had been made by the staff of the Department of City Planning would affect the appearance of the project; and, in doing so, he emphasized that the conditions would result in reduction of the floor area of the total project by approximately 62,000 square feet. The Pacific Medical Center was willing to agree to such a reduction; and, in addition, the Center was prepared to agree that any future expansion of the Medical Center beyond what was reflected in the Master Plan would be constructed on additional properties which will be acquired to the south or southwest of the complex. However, while the Pacific Medical Center would be willing to conform to the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning at the present time, Mr. Schwarberg hoped that the Commission would be willing to maintain some flexibility regarding the staff recommendation for removal of two floors from Building H-2; and, if at some future date it should be determined by the Medical Center that the two additional floors are needed for the smooth operation of the hospital, he hoped that the matter could be reopened for reconsideration by the Commission. Removal of the two floors would reduce the private bed ratio in the hospital from 60% to 38%; and, in addition, the hospital rooms to be contained on the two floors had been designed to connect with service floors in the hospital building now under construction. With regard to the hours of operation of the garage beneath Building A-1, he noted that some of the doctors who will maintain offices in the building will maintain their own appointment schedules; and, as a result, he felt that it would be desirable if the garage could be in operation between the hours of 7 a.m. or 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. rather than the hours 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. In addition, he agreed with the Commission that it would not be desirable for the resolution of approval to contain a condition requiring the Medical Center to subsidize employee parking. He stated that the Pacific Medical Center does provide parking spaces for its employees at less cost than to the general public; and, in any case, parking arrangements are the subject of constant negotiation in labor discussions.



Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Pacific Medical Center would petition the Commission for reconsideration of the two additional floors on Building H-2 before construction of the building is initiated with foundations designed to accommodate the two additional floors. Mr. Schwarberg replied in the affirmative. He stated that construction of Building H-2 will not be undertaken for approximately three to five years; and he felt that it would be easier to evaluate the effect of the two additional floors from the point of view of both the Medical Center and the neighborhood at that time. He indicated that the Medical Center was also in agreement with the staff of the Department of City Planning concerning the recommendations which had been made for traffic control in the area; and he indicated that he would be willing to continue to work with residents of the neighborhood and with the staff of the Department of City Planning to find solutions to the traffic problems.

Edgar Bissinger, President of the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council, read the following prepared statement:

"There are many policies stated in the Urban Design Plan which call for further changes in the Medical Center Master Plan.

"I shall quote only two of these from the chapter on Neighborhood Environment. Page 131 'Protect the livability and character of residential properties from the intrusion of incompatible new buildings'. Page 124 'Protect residential areas from the noise, pollution and physical danger of excessive traffic.'

"The word 'protect' is the key word in both these policies, and it is the protection of our residential neighborhood for which we now appeal to you.

"We are only one of the many neighborhoods who have appeared before you or will be here with the same plea. A few weeks ago the residents of Russian Hill appealed to you for preservation of their area in accordance with the Urban Design Plan, and you granted them the same protection we now ask for our neighborhood.

"We do not oppose reasonable expansion of the Medical Center but ask that the height and bulk of buildings be reduced to a scale commensurate with the surrounding area, that adequate open space be provided, and that vehicular traffic be channelled away from our residential streets.

"Some may think of Pacific Heights as an area of single people and childless couples. As to our immediate neighborhood, nothing could be further from the truth. Many young couples with families make their homes in our neighborhood.

"Children play on our streets and ride their bikes in safety now. But if you approve this huge project and its 1400 parking spaces our streets will indeed be filled with the 'noise, pollution and danger of excessive traffic' which you have vowed to protect us from.



"I have spoken of our neighborhood but in a larger sense this is the problem of our entire city. Are we to destroy, or will we protect the livability and character of our residential areas as the Urban Design Plan has promised.

"The answer is in your hands, and your decision today can set an example and create a precedent for the preservation of all our San Francisco neighborhoods."

President Newman asked if Mr. Bissinger could make some specific comments regarding the recommendations which had been made by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Bissinger stated that he objected to any access to the proposed garage under Building A-1 from Buchanan Street. Furthermore, whereas the resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning would allow some of the buildings in the project to reach a height of 160 feet, he felt that a maximum height of 95 feet would be more acceptable.

John Field, also representing the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council, stated that the association had already sent members of the Commission its recommendations for modifications to the Pacific Medical Center's Master Plan. The same recommendations had been included on a petition which had been circulated around the neighborhood; and 307 signatures had been obtained on the petition. He submitted a copy of the petition for the files of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Field noted that both the closing of Clay Street and authorization for the main hospital building had been approved by the Commission before a master plan had been prepared for the complex; and he remarked that those actions had been very helpful to the Medical Center in terms of its financing. However, it seemed to him that approval of the Master Plan at the present time would somewhat resemble buying something without knowing what it costs. He did not believe that the height and bulk of the proposed buildings was made clear by the model which had been prepared of the proposed project; and, to illustrate his point, he distributed a photograph of the building now under construction and pointed out that it is completely out of scale with any other buildings which presently exist in the neighborhood. He urged that the Commission take action to prevent the addition of two more floors to the building which is now under construction. He felt that the 1400-car parking garage, which would have a traffic flow of one vehicle every 45 seconds, would actually have a greater volume of business than the Sutter-Stockton garage; and he pointed out that the additional traffic would have a severe effect on the neighborhood. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was essential that no access to the garage should be provided from Buchanan Street. While the Medical Center had claimed that 500 hospital beds were absolutely essential and that the two additional floors proposed for the building now under construction would be necessary to provide space for those beds, he remarked that some of the space which had been proposed for medical offices could just as well be used for hospital beds; and, for that reason, he did not feel that the Commission should feel bound to approve the two additional floors on the hospital building. Finally, he noted that projects such as the one presently under consideration, which are commercial rather than residential in character, inevitably affect the quality of adjacent residential districts; and he urged the Commission to make every effort to protect the adjacent residential neighborhood in accordance with the principles stated in the Urban Design Plan.



President Newman asked how traffic would get into and out of the garage beneath Building A-1 if no access were to be provided from Buchanan Street. Mr. Field replied that the master plans called for approximately 200 more spaces than would technically be required by the City Planning Code; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the garage beneath Building A-1 could be eliminated. In any case, he did not feel that access to the garage from Buchanan Street should be approved until recommendations have been received from the Police Department, the Fire Department, and other appropriate City agencies.

Michael Luten, 2308 Buchanan Street, stated that he had only recently purchased his property which is located immediately across the street from the proposed entrance to the parking garage for Building A-1; and he indicated that he would prefer not to have a garage entrance located across the street from his house. He also understood that Building A-1 would be located on land which is zoned both R-3 and R-4; and he did not believe that the Commission has jurisdiction under the City Planning Code to authorize the construction of an office building in a R-3 district.

Mrs. Arthur Bloomfield, 2229 Webster Street, stated it was her understanding that the exit from the medical office building garage would be across the vacated portion of Clay Street onto Webster Street. She stated that she had agreed with other residents of the neighborhood in their opposition to the garage entrance from Buchanan Street; however, she had not been aware until the present meeting that the location of the elevator core for the building would make it difficult to change the entrance. While the subject neighborhood is well served by the Municipal Railway, she felt that the staff requirement for 1400 parking spaces for the Medical Center complex would not be inappropriate especially since there would still be only one parking space available for every three people who would be coming to the Medical Center. With regard to the issue of whether or not a performance bond should be required for the landscaping, she remarked that the hospital had constructed a building across the street from her house five or six years ago which contained special planting boxes for landscaping; yet, no plants had been installed in the planters until approximately six months ago. She acknowledged that the administration of the hospital has changed several times during the past few years and that she had no specific reason for distrusting the present administration; yet, she felt that it would be desirable to require that a performance bond be posted to assure that landscaping will be installed and maintained for the new facilities. With regard to the matter of a parking subsidy, she stated that it was her understanding that most employees of the hospital enjoy a special reduced parking rate; however, some individuals who are entitled to free parking spaces had indicated to her that they would still prefer to park on the street if curbside parking spaces are available. She stated that she liked the fact that the project would be scaled down somewhat if the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning were adopted; however, since the Department of Public Works, the Police Department, the Fire Department, and other appropriate City agencies had not yet made recommendations as to how the traffic problems which would be caused by the proposed facility might be handled, she felt that it would be desirable for the Commission to delay action on the Master Plan until those recommendations are received.



Richard Darlinghouse, 2310 Buchanan Street, stated that he did not understand the functional difficulty which required that the entrance to the parking garage for Building A-1 be located on Buchanan Street; however, part of the difficulty seemed to involve the need to provide truck loading facilities for the new hospital building on the vacated portion of Clay Street. He asked if the truck loading bay would be moved to another location when Building A-2 is constructed. Mr. Schwarberg replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Darlinghouse then remarked that it was unfortunate that a temporary functional problem, which might exist for a maximum of two years, would require construction of a permanent entrance to the garage from Buchanan Street. He indicated, however, that the entrance from Buchanan Street would be acceptable if Buchanan were closed by construction of a cul-de-sac immediately adjacent to the proposed driveway. In conclusion, he stated that he agreed with the petition which had been submitted by Mr. Field; and he felt that action on the matter should be delayed until a traffic plan has been worked out by the various City departments involved.

Mrs. King, a resident on Buchanan Street, stated that the adjacent neighborhood is residential in character and accustomed to quiet Sundays; and she felt it would be ridiculous to ruin the quality of the neighborhood simply because of a temporary problem relating to the loading and unloading of trucks. Since the City had already vacated a portion of Clay Street to the Medical Center for its own use, she felt that the vacated street area should be used for entrance to the proposed parking garage in the interest of protecting the adjacent residential neighborhood. She urged the Commission to reject the applicant's request for entrance to the parking garage from Buchanan Street.

Matthew J. Boxer, President of the Pacific Heights Merchants and Property Owners Association, stated that his organization favored the proposed Medical Center development and felt that it would help to improve the district. He was surprised that some people seemed to feel that the number of parking spaces required by the staff would be too many, especially since he felt that availability of on-site parking spaces would ultimately reduce the number of vehicles parking on the streets.

Harold Burkhart, stated that he owns more property within a 300 foot radius of the subject site than anyone else; and he indicated that one of his buildings abuts the hospital's annex building. During the past forty years, he had never once found the hospital to be an objectionable neighbor; and, contrary to the belief of some, the hospital had not hurt property values in the area. He had, however, found traffic to be somewhat of a problem; and he believed that the traffic situation could be helped if Buchanan Street were to become a one-way street. He remarked that many of the people who had signed the petition which had been submitted by Mr. Field are transients rather than property owners; and, as a property owner, it was his desire that the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted.

A resident of Washington Street stated that she objected to the fact that the fumes from the medical office building garage would be blown onto adjacent residential properties.



Michael Painter, representing the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that the members of his organization were concerned about the massiveness and the intensity of the proposed development. He was pleased that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the scale of some of the buildings be reduced; however, he felt that some of the buildings on the peripheries of the site should be further reduced in scale to accomplish a transition between the medical center and the surrounding neighborhood.

Malcolm McPherson, 2451 Buchanan Street, noting that the temporary necessity for access to the garage from Buchanan Street would cease to exist in approximately two years, asked if it would be possible for the Commission to include a condition in its resolution requiring that the driveway be permanently closed when other entrances to the garage become available. He also suggested that the highest possible number of parking spaces be required for the Medical Center since the employees of the facility would more than likely park in the garages if space is available even if no parking subsidy were to be assumed by the Medical Center.

Mrs. Warren Wilson, 2311 Webster Street, asked the Commission to consider that the future of the neighborhood would depend upon the action taken on the subject application.

A resident of Buchanan Street remarked that the surrounding neighborhood is not 100 percent residential in character insofar as it contains grocery stores, laundries, and a convalescent home. He felt that the hospital had brought tremendous improvement to the area; and he believed that the residents of the neighborhood should be willing to make any compromises which would be necessary to allow the hospital to proceed with its expansion plans.

William H. Gilmartin, 2224 Clay Street, remarked that residents of the neighborhood had stressed the fact that a garage entrance from Buchanan Street would not be acceptable; and he felt that the traffic which would be generated by that garage entrance would have a real detrimental effect on the neighborhood. He indicated that he subscribed to Mr. Field's statement that none of the buildings in the Medical Center complex should exceed 95 feet in height. He was particularly concerned about the massiveness and height of the hospital building now under construction; and he felt that it would be desirable to reduce the height of that building by two stories even if it were necessary to increase the height of building H-2 by two stories to make up for the lost space. In any case, since the University of California Medical Center operates successfully with only 35% of its rooms devoted to single occupancy, he felt that the Pacific Medical Center should be satisfied with 37% of its rooms available for single occupancy. Since the subject neighborhood seems to be in worse shape than Lockheed, he felt that it, also, needs to be "bailed out." He noted that there are approximately 400 private properties within a very close radius of the Medical Center; and, if the market value of those properties were investigated, he believed that it would be found that the Pacific Medical Center has not, in fact, helped the neighborhood.

President Newman stated that he had received a letter from L.S. Grapp, 2267 Clay Street, in which Mr. Grapp had stated that he felt that the proposed medical center would enhance the neighborhood and increase property values in the area.



Lewis Lindsay stated that he had nothing against the proposed hospital; however, he felt that none of the buildings in the proposed complex should exceed a height of 95 feet. Furthermore, in order to lessen traffic congestion in the area, he felt that the Municipal Railway should provide more frequent and more direct service to the Medical Center.

Russell King felt that the proposed Medical Center would be too immense for the neighborhood. He also remarked that the Embarcadero Freeway would be beautiful to look at as compared to the hospital building which is now under construction in the subject neighborhood.

Mr. Skinner, 2210 Buchanan Street, described himself as a "transient." However, because he loves the Victorian house in which he lives, he is willing to pay rent in the amount of \$8,000 a year. He pointed out that the number of "transients" will inevitably increase as the neighborhood becomes more unlivable.

The Director indicated that he wished to respond to some of the comments which had been made by members of the audience. Whereas Mr. Bissinger had pointed out that the Urban Design Plan calls for protection of residential neighborhoods in terms of character and development and in terms of traffic, he emphasized that the staff of the Department of City Planning is fully aware of the principles and policies stated in the Urban Design Plan and is trying its best to accomplish those objectives. Mr. Bissinger had also objected to certain buildings in the project which would contain a height of 160 feet; but the Director pointed out that where it had been possible to do so the height of buildings in the project had been kept below 160 feet. Other speakers had proposed that the maximum height of any buildings in the project should be 95 feet; however, the Director felt that establishment of such a limit would either cause the Medical Center to spill over into the adjacent residential neighborhood or else have the effect of saying that there should be no Medical Center in the subject neighborhood. Both Mr. Field and Mr. Gilmartin had urged that the two additional floors proposed for the hospital building now under construction be deleted; however, since the Commission had approved plans for that building approximately two years ago, the Director did not feel that the authorization could be revoked at the present time. He disagreed with Mr. Field's contention that the Medical Center's garage would generate a greater volume of traffic than the Sutter-Stockton garage; and he did not feel that it would be functionally feasible to use space in the office building for hospital beds. Mr. Luten had questioned the Commission's authority to allow construction of an office building in an R-3 district; but the Director informed him that such use of R-3 property may be authorized as part of a Planned Unit Development. Mrs. Bloomfield had expressed skepticism regarding the installation and maintenance of landscaping on the site. The Director stated that it was for that reason that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that a performance bond be required; and he noted that the Pacific Medical Center had agreed to that condition. He also remarked that landscaping is usually the first thing to be cut from a budget when development costs increase; and, in order to make sure that such a situation would not arise in the present instance, he felt that the performance bond should be required. Mrs. Bloomfield had also recommended that approval of the Master Plan be postponed until solutions to the traffic problems have been worked out in detail. The Director remarked that a relatively long period of time would be required for that purpose; and, while he recognized that an element of risk would be involved in approving the application at the present time, he felt that it would be fair to take that risk.



The Director noted that more members of the audience had commented on the garage entrance from Buchanan Street than on any other issue; and he indicated that there appeared to be four alternative approaches to that problem. The first approach, which would probably be the least acceptable to the neighborhood, would be to adopt the draft resolution without changes, thus approving construction of the driveway. A second approach would be to construct the garage beneath the medical office building in the beginning but to defer use of the facility until access can be provided to it by some approach other than from Buchanan Street; yet, while such an alternative might be acceptable to the neighborhood, he doubted that it would be acceptable to the Pacific Medical Center and the doctors who would be occupying the office building. A third alternative would be to provide temporary access from Buchanan Street until other access to the garage becomes feasible. Such an alternative would leave the neighborhood with the threat that the driveway might possibly become permanent in the future; and, in any case, he doubted that the hospital would be willing to spend money for the construction of a ramp which would have to be removed at a later date. A fourth alternative would be to take the position that no garage should be built beneath building A-1. Yet, while that alternative might be the best of the lot from the point of view of the neighborhood, it might result in the provision of a lesser number of parking spaces and might, in fact, necessitate the granting of a parking variance.

The Director stated that he would be prepared to recommend the fourth alternative to the Commission as long as everyone fully understood that it might not be possible to replace the 200 parking spaces which would be lost elsewhere on the Medical Center site.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked what means of access had been proposed for the parking spaces which would be located beneath building A-2. Gordon Chester, representing Wilbur Smith and Associates, Traffic Consultants for the applicants, replied that access to those parking spaces, as well as to the parking spaces which would be located beneath building A-1, would be gained from Buchanan Street. He stated that the estimate which his firm had made of the future traffic volume on Buchanan Street had been predicated not upon the number of parking spaces which would be available but on the number of people who would be coming to Buchanan Street for entrance to the hospital and medical office buildings because of their Buchanan and Clay Streets address. He predicted that people would automatically be drawn to the intersection of Buchanan and Clay Streets because of the address; and, unless an entrance to the parking garage were available at that point, motorists would probably wander undirected around the neighborhood looking for a parking space. In any case, the traffic volume which would be carried by local streets in the subject neighborhood would in no way be comparable to the heavy traffic volumes of the James Lick Freeway, Franklin Street, or other major arteries. Based on traffic counts which had been made in August, streets in the neighborhood presently carry the following number of vehicles each day: Buchanan Street, 1500; Washington Street, 1800; Laguna Street, 3500; Sacramento Street, 5500; and Fillmore Street, 7000. Based on the projections which had been made by his firm, it was anticipated that traffic on Buchanan Street will not rise beyond the present level of traffic volume on Washington Street when the Medical Center complex is completed; and he noted that the present volume of traffic on Buchanan Street is only 15% of its level "C" capacity. After construction of the Medical Center, the traffic volume on Buchanan Street will not exceed 23% of its level "C" capacity.



President Newman asked Mr. Chester what his recommendation would be for solution of the Medical Center's traffic problems if the Commission should determine that there should be no entrance to the parking garage from Buchanan Street. Mr. Chester replied that he anticipated that motorists would wander aimlessly around the neighborhood looking for a parking place if no entrance to the parking garage were to be provided from Buchanan Street; however, that situation might be overcome to some extent if large signs were to be posted at the intersections of Buchanan Street with Sacramento and Washington Streets advising motorists of the location of the entrance to the garage. However, since garages are usually located adjacent to the facilities which they serve, he believed that refusal by the Commission to permit a driveway to the garage from Buchanan Street would inevitably cause serious traffic congestion in the area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Chester if the projections which had been made by his firm had indicated that traffic on Sacramento Street would be increased as a result of the proposed project. Mr. Chester replied that his firm had not analyzed the traffic on Sacramento Street; the study was limited to Buchanan and Webster Streets. The traffic on Webster Street at the present time is at 35% of the street's level "C" capacity; and, with construction of the Medical Center, it was anticipated that the volume of traffic on the street would rise to 67% of the street's level "C" capacity. If automobile access is provided to the parking garage from Sacramento Street, traffic volume on Webster Street will be reduced to 57% of the street's level "C" capacity. In reply to a further question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. Chester stated that he did not feel that traffic congestion on Webster Street would be very bad even if the volume of traffic on the street should reach 100% of the street's level "C" capacity.

Mrs. Bloomfield asked that members of the audience be permitted to vote on the four alternative approaches to the Buchanan Street issue which had been mentioned by the Director. When President Newman called for a show of hands, most of the people in the audience indicated that they would prefer that the garage not be built beneath building A-1.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that residents of the subject neighborhood might find it difficult to get in and out of their own garages because of the illegally parked automobiles if the garage beneath building A-1 were not to be constructed; and, therefore, he felt that the garage should be approved. He then moved that the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted subject to two amendments which would delete the reference to subsidized parking in Condition No. 7 and which would provide that the parking garage under building A-1 could be open between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. seven days a week. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Porter.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he is in the real estate business and that he deals with designs for projects on a daily basis. He did not feel that a refusal of the particular plan under consideration would amount to a refusal of the Pacific Medical Center; rather, a refusal of the plan would constitute a call for an entirely new design for the proposed project. Given the size of the property owned by the Pacific Medical Center, and given the variety of available solutions to the problems being faced, he believed that it should be possible for the Medical Center to come forth with plans which would be more in conformity with the character



and scale of the neighborhood than the plans presently under consideration. Furthermore, he noted that several major problems, such as garage entrances and excessive height, remained unresolved in the plans which had been submitted; and he felt that the project, if constructed as proposed, would be heavy and ponderous. Although he was aware of the tremendous design problems which have to be faced in preparing plans for such a medical facility, and although he realized that even the project which had been proposed would probably increase property values in the area, he felt that most of the project, with the exception of office buildings A-1 and A-2, by its very massiveness would have a permanent disastrous effect on the entire surrounding neighborhood. He stated that he intended to vote against the motion which was before the Commission.

Commissioner Porter felt that the real issue before the Commission was whether or not there should be a medical center on the subject site; and she remarked that the Commission had committed itself as early as 1964 to the construction of the proposed medical center. Based on the experiences which other neighborhoods have had with major hospital facilities, she had no doubt that the proposed project would, in fact, impose a burden on the residents of the subject neighborhood. Yet, she did not feel that it would be possible for the Commission to tell the Pacific Medical Center that it must take its project somewhere else. She stated that never during her experience on the City Planning Commission had the staff included so many conditions in its draft resolution of approval for a project; and she felt that the traffic problems which remained unsolved could be worked out satisfactorily. Therefore, she intended to vote for adoption of the draft resolution approving the Master Plan for the Medical Center.

Commissioner Rueda again questioned whether the draft resolution should be adopted before a specific figure is inserted in the blank in subsection "b" of Condition No. 1 to specify the actual height of the base of the dome of Congregation Sherith Israel Temple. Mr. Schwarberg stated that the Pacific Medical Center would be willing to accept the figure to be determined by the staff of the Department of City Planning at a later date.

Commissioner Mellon agreed with Commissioner Porter that the real issue before the Commission was whether or not a medical center should be constructed on the subject site; and he indicated that he intended to support the motion for approval of the Master Plan for the medical center.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 6-1 to adopt Resolution No. 6759 and approve the Master Plan for expansion of the Pacific Medical Center subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning, as modified. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Newman, Porter, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio  
Secretary









